

**County of San Luis Obispo**

**PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN**  
**FOR UNINCORPORATED AREA FACILITIES**



**County of San Luis Obispo**

**PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN**  
**FOR UNINCORPORATED AREA FACILITIES**

*Prepared for:*  
**SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY**

*Prepared by:*  
**RECHT HAUSRATH & ASSOCIATES**  
**URBAN ECONOMISTS<sup>4</sup>**  
**1212 Broadway, Suite 1700**  
**Oakland, California 94612**  
**October 8, 1991**

**ADOPTED BY**  
**THE SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**October 15, 1991 by Res. No. 91-536**

**Amended April 25, 2006 by Res. No. 2006-151**

# **County of San Luis Obispo**

## **PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN** **FOR UNINCORPORATED AREA FACILITIES**

*Prepared for:*  
**SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY**

*Amendment Prepared by:*  
**TOWN HALL SERVICES**  
**830 Woodside Road, Suite 4**  
**Redwood City, California 94061**  
**(650) 373-7373/FAX 373-7370**

**February 2006**

**Amendment Adopted By**  
**The San Luis Obispo County Board Of Supervisors**  
**April 25, 2006 by Res. No. 2006-151**

**County of San Luis Obispo**

**PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN  
FOR UNINCORPORATED AREA FACILITIES**

**Board of Supervisors**

Harry Ovitt, District 1  
Shirley Bianchi, District 2  
James Patterson, District 3  
K. H. Achadjian, District 4  
Jerry Lenthall, District 5

**Department of Planning and Building**

Victor Holanda, AICP, Director  
Pat Beck, Assistant Planning Director  
Kami Griffin, Supervising Planner  
Chris Macek, Secretary

**County of San Luis Obispo**

**PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN  
FOR UNINCORPORATED AREA FACILITIES**

**Adopted**

October 15, 1991 by Res. No. 91-536

**Amended**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Res. No.</u>
February 16, 1993	93-83
April 12, 1994	94-159
July 19, 1994	94-292
November 21, 1995	95-466
December 10, 1996	96-486
April 28, 1998	98-127
December 16, 2003	2003-465
April 25, 2006	2006-151

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## **PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING PLAN FOR UNINCORPORATED AREA FACILITIES**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>Chapter 1    Introduction &amp; Summary.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2    Existing Development and Projections of New Development.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Chapter 3    Parks.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 4    Sheriff's Patrol &amp; Investigation.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 5    General Government and Other County Facilities.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 6    Fire .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Chapter 7    Library .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Chapter 8    Affordable Housing .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix A   Building Costs .....</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>Appendix B   Land Costs .....</b>	<b>B</b>





## **Chapter 1**

### **INTRODUCTION & SUMMARY**

County facilities provide services for the benefit of all county residents and employees, or some portion of this total service population. As the service population increases, so does the demand for County facilities. As developers build new homes and non-residential buildings, the County must provide proportional amounts of facilities to serve this new development if it is to maintain existing standards.

This report documents the amount and cost of new capital facilities required to serve new development in unincorporated areas through the year 2025. One potential source of funding is public facilities fees, or impact fees, paid by new development to fund its fair share of facilities needs. This report documents the maximum justified level of those fees. The introduction to the Public Facilities Financing Plan summarizes the Plan under the following topics:

- Public Facilities Financing in California
- Fee Determination
- Facilities Costs and Fee Schedules
- Implementation and Administration
- Collection and Disbursement

This introduction is intended to provide a general understanding of the concepts and methodology used to design public facilities fees and a summary of the findings in this report. The succeeding chapters each contain a detailed analysis of the specific costs and assumptions involved in the calculation of each fee.

### **PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING IN CALIFORNIA**

Several events during the past decades have undercut the financial capacity of local governments to build infrastructure: passage of Proposition 13, difficulty passing bond initiatives, and severe reductions in federal and state assistance. Since Proposition 13, property taxes have been inadequate to fund capital needs, and have been generally insufficient for ongoing operations and maintenance expenses at pre-Proposition levels of service. As an immediate response to their funding crisis, cities and counties throughout California cut back services, deferred maintenance, and reduced capital investment. Generally, this was true of San Luis Obispo County.

As a longer-term response, most cities and counties have shifted a portion of the burden of financing the capital costs of additional infrastructure from tax revenues and general obligation bonds to the new development causing the need for infrastructure. This shift has primarily been accomplished through the imposition of public facilities fees, also known as development impact fees. Some fee programs address only a few specific facilities, such as sewer, fire, or storm

drainage, while other local government fee programs are comprehensive, requiring developers to pay for all additions to municipal facilities needed to accommodate new development.

As a result of widespread imposition of public facilities fees, the State Legislature passed AB 1600 adding Government Code sections 66000 et seq. which lay ground rules for imposition and ongoing administration of fees. The law, which became effective in January 1989, requires local governments to document the nexus between the amount of new development and the facilities that will be built to accommodate it. The legal requirements restrict how local governments may impose and use public facilities fees. Yet these requirements have also made local governments less vulnerable to litigation and have given developers a more predictable environment in which to build.

The nexus principle was established by *Nollan Volbrecht Surveys v. The California State Coastal Commission*, 483 U.S. 825 (1987). Nexus requires that the fee amount mitigate only those impacts new development creates for additional infrastructure to serve it. The courts further refined the nexus issue in *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U.S. 687 (1994). This case has established the concept of “rough proportionality,” whereby the fees being charged on a development must be proportional to the impacts that will result from the development. Both the Nollan and the Dolan cases have been carefully considered in the ongoing implementation of this public facilities fees program.

It is important to distinguish between a fee for public facilities financing and a tax. Fees must conform to the conditions imposed by the Nollan and Dolan decisions and AB 1600 and be used exclusively to fund the capital costs of new facilities. In addition, fees only require action by the elected governing board of a city or county to be imposed. Taxes, on the other hand, may be used for either capital or operating and maintenance costs, and tax increases generally must be approved by the voters. Consequently, it is critical in the documentation for any public facilities fee program to demonstrate that the fee is not greater than the cost of facilities to accommodate new development to avoid being challenged as a tax. The Public Facilities Financing Plan serves that purpose.

In contrast to most cities in the state, California counties have been far less aggressive imposing comprehensive fees that will fund the full costs of all additional infrastructure serving growth. Increasingly, however, counties are pursuing public facilities fees as a viable means of accommodating new development; San Luis Obispo County has levied fees on development since 1991. This report is a comprehensive reassessment of the justification for it continuing to do so. Public facilities fees that fund county facilities to serve the unincorporated area are calculated in this report. This report serves the purpose of documenting the nexus between the needs generated by new development, and fees to fund facilities to serve that development.

## **FEE DETERMINATION**

The design of a public facilities fee program follows a six-step process: (1) selecting a time period; (2) projecting new development; (3) determining facility service areas; (4) identifying

facilities to accommodate new development; (5) estimating their costs; and (6) selecting an appropriate and equitable means to allocate costs among new development.

### **(1) Selecting Appropriate Time Period**

The determination of public facilities fees begins with the selection of the projection period for population and employment growth. As with the earlier comprehensive assessment, a 20-year planning period is used. The facilities needed to serve development occurring in the 2005-2025 period are analyzed.

### **(2) Projecting New Development**

Projections of new development provide the basis for projections of additional facilities required to serve growth. The Plan uses population and employment projections provided by the planning departments of the County and the seven cities. (Population, employment and square feet of new development are analyzed in Chapter 2.) These projections are summarized in Tables 1-1 and 1-2.

**Table 1-1  
Population Projections**

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>Growth</b>
Countywide	247,156	328,493	81,337
Unincorporated Areas	101,460	146,550	45,090

*Note: Population does not include population living in group quarters.*

*Source: Planning and Building Department, San Luis Obispo County, 2005.*

**Table 1-2  
Employment Projections**

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>Growth</b>
Countywide	103,100	137,123	34,023
Unincorporated Areas	30,105	43,351	13,246

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

### **(3) Determining Facility Service Areas**

Public facilities serve different geographical areas, and fees can only fund facilities that serve development in the area paying the fee. Therefore, growth forecasts and facilities needs are assessed for different service areas depending on the service. As examples, libraries serve all residents and employees countywide, Sheriff's patrol serves the entire unincorporated area, and fire stations are located only in portions of the unincorporated area.

#### **(4) Identifying Facilities to Accommodate Growth**

The determination of the quantity of new facilities required to serve new development requires adoption of standards. These standards establish minimum levels of service for existing and future county infrastructure. Standards are often stated in terms of a department's number of staff or amount of facilities per capita (e.g. acres of park land per capita). The new facilities that development must fund is then calculated according to these standards and projected population and employment growth.

The County usually can adopt standards that reduce, maintain, or increase the present levels of service provided for the existing population. However, the County must use alternative funds to expand existing facilities if it wishes to base fees on a standard higher than the existing level of facilities.

#### **(5) Estimating Facilities Costs**

Building costs are based on the costs of recently constructed buildings. (Building costs are discussed in Appendix A.) Land costs are based on surveys, complemented with additional information specific to each service. (Land costs are discussed in Appendix B.)

#### **(6) Allocating Facilities Costs**

The number of new residents and employees is used to determine facilities needs, while fees are usually paid based on the physical amount of new development (e.g. the number of dwelling units or amount of building space). Thus, the final step distributes total facilities costs among land use categories based on the population or employment density of each category. This approach ensures that fees are directly related to the cost of facilities required to accommodate a particular type of development.

This study uses five categories: single-family residential; multi-family residential; office; retail; and industrial. For most types of facilities, fees for residential projects are based upon the average number of residents per dwelling unit, and fees for non-residential projects are charged on the average number of employees per 1,000 square feet. In some cases, such as parks and recreation, costs are only allocated to residential development because non-residential development is not assumed to generate a demand for this type of facility. The need for fire facilities is based on the square footage of development protected; similarly, the fee is expressed in terms of a per square foot amount.

### **FACILITIES COSTS AND FEE SCHEDULES**

Table 1-3 summarizes the costs of facilities for unincorporated area services necessary to accommodate development in unincorporated areas of the county to the year 2025. Costs shown do not include facilities needed to improve existing standards or correct deficiencies.

Table 1-4 presents the public facilities fees if new development is required to fund the costs shown in Table 1-4. Only new development in unincorporated areas would pay the fees because these facilities are associated with unincorporated services only. The fees would not apply in cities (incorporated areas). The "Fee Administration" charges are explained following the table.

It can be seen that all of the residential fees except fire are levied on a per housing unit basis, reflecting the fact that the number of persons living in a unit (and being served by public facilities) is not generally proportional to the square footage of the unit. The majority of fire facilities, however, protect property and thus have a closer nexus to the square footage of the unit. The fire fee is thus based on the square footage being constructed. As a result, fire fees are levied on additions, even though the other facilities fees are not.

**Table 1-3**  
**Cost of Facilities**  
**To Accommodate Unincorporated Area Growth**  
*(millions of 2005 dollars)*

Facility Type	
Parks	\$36,635,000
Sheriff	6,184,000
General Government	11,784,000
Fire	35,985,000
Library	16,270,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$106,858,000</b>

**Table 1-4**  
**PUBLIC FACILITIES FEES**

Facilities	Residential (per dwelling unit)		Non-residential (per 1,000 building square feet)		
	Single Family	Multi- Family	Office	Retail	Industrial
Parks	2,156	1,641			
Sheriff	262	199	353	212	152
General Govt.	499	380	673	404	289
Fire	1,856* (based on sq ft of 2,210)	840* (based on sq ft of 1,000)	840	840	840
Library	425	323	223	134	96
Subtotal	5,198	3,383	2,089	1,590	1,377
Admin Fee @2.0%	104	68	42	32	28
Total	\$5,302	\$3,451	\$2,131	\$1,622	\$1,405
Increase	46%	67%	4%	32%	60%

*\*The fire fee is the only facilities fee on residential development that is not a fixed amount per unit; it varies by the size of unit. The fee is \$840 per 1,000 feet. The table shows fees for a 2,210 sq. ft. single family homes and a 1,000 sq. ft. multi-family homes.*

## IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A small part of the cost of supplying the facilities to accommodate development consists of the documentation, administration and implementation expenses of the fee program. At the time of adopting this plan in 1991, it was estimated that 2.5 percent of all fees collected appeared to be reasonable for these costs. The County has monitored the actual expenses incurred compared to

the 2.5 percent estimate. Based on that monitoring, a 2.0 percent surcharge on all fees collected to cover these overhead costs is justified. The annual review of the program, required by law, will verify that the assumptions on which the fees are based remain generally applicable and will make adjustments for inflation. In addition, a periodic longer-term review will allow for detailed re-examination of all assumptions such as growth forecasts, development trends, facilities needs, annexation policies, inflation, and land costs. Such reviews will help attune long range infrastructure planning to the County's changing needs.

The ongoing implementation and administration of a public facilities fee program involves adopting new procedures, training personnel, tracking facility costs and accounting for fee revenues. In addition, County staff is frequently faced with particular situations in which they must interpret the program's criteria and render special judgments. Administrative guidelines have been established to provide staff and the development community with guidance regarding ongoing operation of the program. The guidelines are intended to maintain consistent standards regardless of county personnel turnover or updates to the fee program.

## **COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT**

The public facilities fees are collected at time of building permit issuance. The fees will not be collected on vacant land until development occurs. Fees will only be collected on developed land if the existing structures are being expanded or otherwise modified to allow more intense use of the property.

Fee revenues for each facility area are collected in a separate trust account, and interest earned on fund balances are credited to that account. Funds will be transferred from that account to specific accounts for construction as needed to finance the facilities required to serve new development. These facilities are summarized in their respective chapters of this plan, and in greater detail in specific master plans prepared by each department. The proposed facilities for each type of service are reflected as an attachment to the Resolution adopting the Public Facilities Financing Plan and will be reviewed and revised as needed through the annual review of the Public Facilities Fee program. The County uses the Capital Improvement Program to indicate the actual phasing and location of new facilities.





## Chapter 2

### EXISTING DEVELOPMENT AND PROJECTIONS OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

The PFF program is based on the premise that new development should contribute impact fees adequate to maintain the existing level of investment in public facilities used to provide County services. The existing level is measured using the following indicators of the need for public services: population; employment; and square feet of development, as appropriate for the different facility types. Projections for new development are used as the basis for determining the facilities needed by each of the service areas discussed in the Public Facilities Financing Plan.

This plan is for a planning period of twenty years, 2005 to 2025. Information was gathered about current population, employment, and both residential and non-residential square footage within the county. Projections were prepared for population, employment and square footage in 2025. Both present and future information were generated for the county as a whole, as well as for unincorporated areas of the county. The former was used to determine the need for countywide facilities, namely the library system. Unincorporated area projections were applied to facilities used by the County for services focused on unincorporated areas, such as neighborhood and community parks.

#### POPULATION

The County Planning and Building Department prepares population estimates for the entire County. According to the most recent projections, the countywide population is forecasted to increase by 33% between 2005 and 2025, while the unincorporated area population is projected to grow by 44% during the same period.

**Table 2-1  
Population Projections**

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>Growth</b>
Countywide	247,156	328,493	81,337
Unincorporated Areas	101,460	146,550	45,090

*Note: Population does not include population living in group quarters.*

*Source: Planning and Building Department of the San Luis Obispo County, 2005.*

The population projections are broken down into projections for each city, unincorporated community and rural planning area. The amount of growth represented in some of the more future projections would require an amendment to the general plan, as the current general plan could not accommodate all of the future growth projected in these areas. Areas where the current plan would be a constraint include Salinas River, Shandon, Huasna-Lopez and Nipomo; however, this constraint seldom comes into play until after 2020.

Although there exists uncertainty with any population projections, differences between projections and actual outcomes usually do not affect development impact fee levels. Fees are unaffected because they typically are based on a per capita requirement for new facilities. In other words, less new development requires fewer new facilities but also generates less impact fee revenue, so the fee per housing unit remains unaffected.

## EMPLOYMENT

Unlike population, estimates for employment growth are not available for the 20-year planning period. After analyzing the available San Luis Obispo County employment data from the 1997 U.S. Economic Census, the State of California Employment Development Department, and the California Statistical Abstracts, we concluded that it was reasonable to assume that the relationship between population and employment would not be undergoing significant change and, if it did, the likely scenario would be a faster growth for employment. This would have the effect that the need for facilities, except for parks, occur slightly sooner than projected here.

**Table 2-2**  
**Employment Projections**

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>Growth</b>
Countywide	103,100	137,123	34,023
Unincorporated Areas	30,105	43,351	13,246

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## SERVICE POPULATION

Service population is the term used in this plan for the count of people who create the need for and benefit from each public service. Population is the indicator commonly used to signify the need generated by residential development for county services. Employment is used as the indicator for services from non-residential development. For services that address the needs of both residential and non-residential development, the two are used in combination to generate a more comprehensive indicator.

The specific service population varies by facility type. Table 2-3 highlights the service population for the following facilities: libraries, sheriff, general government and parks. In

calculating the service population by facility type, no employment amount is allocated to parks, as it is assumed that parks primarily serve residents and provide little benefit to non-residential development. The table also shows how the service population changes depending on the geographical area served; for example, parks primarily serve residents of the unincorporated area (regional parks are not part of the PFF program). The concept of service population is most complex when applied to libraries. A survey determined that 14% of library use was for business purposes. It can be shown that this means that business use, measured on a per employee basis, is 39% of use by residents, measured per resident.

**Table 2-3**  
**Service Population by Facility Type**

<b>Facility Type (1)</b>	<b>Area Served</b>		<b>2005</b>	<b>2025</b>
Libraries (2)	Countywide	Population	247,156	328,493
		Employment	103,100	137,123
		<b>Service Population</b>	<b>287,365</b>	<b>381,971</b>
Sheriff	Unincorporated Areas	Population	101,460	146,550
		Employment	30,105	43,351
		<b>Service Population</b>	<b>131,565</b>	<b>189,901</b>
General Government	Unincorporated Areas	Population	101,460	146,550
		Employment	30,105	43,351
		<b>Service Population</b>	<b>131,565</b>	<b>189,901</b>
Parks (3)	Unincorporated Areas minus Templeton	Population	94,511	136,475
		Employment	0	0
		<b>Service Population</b>	<b>94,511</b>	<b>136,475</b>

(1) Fire is not included among the service areas shown here, as its standard is determined by square-footage and not by service population.

(2) The service population shown is equal to 86% of the resident population plus 14% of the employment.

(3) Templeton collects its own Public Facilities Fee for Parks; thus its population is not included in the service area. Also, Parks does not take employment into account when calculating the service population.

Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.

## SQUARE FOOTAGE

Population and employment are generally good indicators of the need for most types of facilities used to provide County services. It is doubtful, however, that it is the best indicator of the need for the large capital facilities, fire stations and engines, that provide fire suppression services. While fire personnel spend much of their time on life saving calls, the need for fire engines and large stations to house them exists primarily to protect property. The existing standard for fire facilities is therefore being changed to the square footage of buildings, including both residential and non-residential development. Additionally, the need for future stations and equipment to maintain the existing standard is based on the amount of square footage to be developed.

The cities of San Luis Obispo County provide their own fire service, as do the Templeton and Cambria Community Services Districts. As discussed more fully in the chapter on fire facilities, the large majority of the unincorporated land area is protected by the California Department of Forestry, under contract with San Luis Obispo County (the County Fire Department). Six other community service districts that provide services in small communities in various parts of the county participate in the county fee program. This Public Facilities Financing Plan addresses the facilities needed for fire services by the County Fire Department and these six service districts. The building floor area protected by these entities must therefore be determined.

Table 4 shows the numbers of single family and multiple family (apartments and condominiums) units served by these entities. We used a sample of 1,200 single family detached homes to determine an average size; the average size was 1,841 square feet. Multiple family units constitute a much smaller share of the building square footage and a good sample of sizes was not available. We therefore estimated an average size of 1,000 square feet based on our experience in other communities. Using this information, the total residential floor area protected is 60,259,000 square feet, as shown in Table 2-4.

**Table 2-4**  
**Residential Square Footage**  
**Areas Served by the County Fire Department and Service Districts**

	<b>Single Family Detached</b>	<b>Multiple Family</b>	<b>Total Residential</b>
Number of Units (1)	31,903	10,866	
Average Square Footage (2)	1,841	1,000	
Total Square Footage	58,733,000	10,866,000	69,599,000
<b>2005 Square Footage Served by County Fire Department (3)</b>	<b>50,851,000</b>	<b>9,408,000</b>	<b>60,259,000</b>
2025 Square Footage Served by County Fire Department	84,006,000	14,601,000	98,607,000
<b>Growth in Square Footage Served by County Fire Department (4)</b>	<b>33,155,000</b>	<b>5,193,000</b>	<b>38,348,000</b>

(1) The number of units was calculated using 2000 US Census Data for the unincorporated areas of the county, updated to 2005 reflecting 6% growth. Multiple family includes all housing types that are not single family detached.

(2) For single family detached, the average square footage was calculated by analyzing random samples of 1,200 housing units in the unincorporated area of the county. For multiple family, a standard average was employed.

(3) All of the unincorporated area, except for Templeton and Cambria, is served by the County Fire Department and six community services districts. As the populations of Templeton (6.85%) and Cambria (6.57%) comprise 13.42% of the entire population for the unincorporated area, this percentage is deducted from the total square footage for the unincorporated area of the county.

(4) The growth in square footage served by the County Fire Department is made using the following assumptions. For single family detached, there will be a 10% increase on already existing homes due to additions. This is then added to the increase in new homes, estimated to be 46% of already existing homes, at a 20% increase in size. For multiple family, the above equation is used, minus additions.  
Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.

The amount of construction in the next 20 years will determine the property (square footage) the fire department will be protecting in 2025. We assume that new homes will be added at roughly the rate of population growth, 46% of the present number, for both single family detached and multiple family units. We assume that new homes will be larger than the average of existing homes, perhaps 20% larger. Finally, we assume additions will add roughly 10% to the square footage of existing single family detached homes. Table 2-4 includes an estimate of the amount of new residential construction, 38,348,000 square feet. It should be understood that numerous assumptions are involved in this estimate. It should therefore be recognized that the amount constructed could be as much as 20% greater or less than this amount.

**Table 2-5**  
**Non-Residential Square Footage**  
**Areas Served by the County Fire Department**

	<b>Office (1)</b>	<b>Retail (1)</b>	<b>Industrial (1)</b>	<b>Total Non-Residential</b>
Number of Employees (2)	8,544	9,676	5,535	
Average Square Footage (3)	300	500	700	
Total Square Footage	2,563,000	4,838,000	3,874,000	11,275,000
<b>2005 Square Footage Served by County Fire Department (4)</b>	<b>2,219,000</b>	<b>4,189,000</b>	<b>3,354,000</b>	<b>9,762,000</b>
2025 Square Footage Served by County Fire Department	3,240,000	6,116,000	4,897,000	14,253,000
<b>Growth in Square Footage Served by County Fire Department (5)</b>	<b>1,021,000</b>	<b>1,927,000</b>	<b>1,543,000</b>	<b>4,491,000</b>

(1) The categories are high medium and low employee density, typified by the primary use shown for each category.

- (2) Number of employees calculated using assumptions made through analysis of data from the 1997 US Economic Census, the State of California Employment Development Department and the California Statistical Abstracts for San Luis Obispo County.
- (3) For average square footages for various employment types, a standard average was used.
- (4) All of the unincorporated area, except for Templeton and Cambria, is served by the County Fire Department and six community services districts. As the populations of Templeton (6.85%) and Cambria (6.57%) comprise 13.42% of the entire population for the unincorporated area, this percentage is deducted from the total square footage for the unincorporated area of the county.
- (5) It is estimated that the growth in non-residential square footage will be 46% of already existing square footage. Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.

Table 2-5 shows similar estimates of non-residential square footage. Current square footage protected is estimated based on apportionment of employment into three categories, using rule-of-thumb averages for each category to estimate the square footage. We assume that non-residential square footage will increase at roughly the same rate as employment (and population) growth. Given these assumptions, we estimate a total addition of 9,762,000 non-residential square feet protected and project an increase of 4,491,000 square feet in the next 20 years.

The total residential and non-residential square footage of the unincorporated areas served by the County Fire Department and the service districts is 60,259,000 square feet in residential buildings and 9,762,000 square feet in non-residential buildings, a total of 70,021,000 square feet of buildings. The total building floor area protected is projected to increase to roughly 112,860,000 square feet by 2025.

## HOUSING

The standard of facilities serving residential development is calculated, for most services, in terms of dollars per capita. (For fire services, it is calculated in terms of square feet.) In order to calculate the fee that will be levied on each new home (for other than fire), it is necessary to know the average number of persons per home. In the tables below, the persons per unit are calculated using data from the 2000 US Census regarding both the number of housing units and the population in occupied housing units. The housing units are broken into two categories, namely single-family detached and all other types (including apartments, condominiums, and mobile homes).

**Table 2-6**  
**Housing**

	<b>Single-Family Detached</b>	<b>All Other Types</b>	<b>Total</b>
Population in Housing Units	163,067	67,998	231,065
Housing Units	66,079	36,196	102,275
Persons Per Unit	<b>2.47</b>	<b>1.88</b>	<b>2.26</b>

Source: 2000 US Census

## Chapter 3

### PARKS

This chapter presents the public facilities fee part of park facilities financing. It examines neighborhood and community parks that serve unincorporated areas of the county, as well as the portions of some regional parks that have a community-serving component. As with the other components of the PFF program, regional facilities serving the county as a whole, as opposed to serving specific neighborhoods and communities, are not considered. In the previous fee justification document, all park improvements were lumped into a single category. In this report, they are broken down into two categories: general park improvements and special park features.

The parks public facilities fee is calculated based on the existing level of park facilities, i.e. an amount adequate to maintain the existing standard. This level is below the County General Plan standard. Additional funding resources are required if the county is to move toward that standard.

### FACILITIES

#### *Existing Park Facilities*

The Parks Division of San Luis Obispo County Department of General Services currently maintains 12,056 acres of parkland. The County's park acreage is separated into two categories: 1) neighborhood and community parks, including community-serving components of regional parks, and 2) regional parks, including open space. According to the *Parks and Recreation Element*, regional parks tend to include more nature-oriented activities, can be 200 to 1,000 acres in size, and tend to serve persons within one hour's driving time from the park. Thus, since the majority of regional parklands serve all county residents, the only portion of these parks included in the PFF program for the unincorporated area are their community serving portions.

The land itself is a more critical part of park facilities than it is for other public facilities, such as libraries. A greater amount of land per capita is required for parks than for all other public facilities put together; the land's characteristics are central to the nature of a park. Also, the cost of land is a greater share of the cost of parks than it is of other public facilities.

As defined in the *Parks and Recreation Element*, a neighborhood park is typically five to ten acres, is generally within walking distance from the people they intend to serve, and includes passive as well as active recreation uses. In neighborhood parks, the land is typically improved with facilities such as children's play equipment, hard courts, turf areas and individual picnic areas. Community parks are roughly 20 to 25 acres, serve both the local community and outside visitors, and tend to include both active and nature uses. Community parks can include facilities

such as skate parks, sports fields, swimming pools, tennis courts, group picnic areas and community centers. In this analysis, park improvements for neighborhood and community parks are divided into two categories: general park improvements and special park features. *General park improvements*, characteristic to both neighborhood and community parks, consist of elements such as landscaping, simple ballfields and playground structures that convert raw land into a neighborhood park. *Special park features*, more common to community parks, are comprised of more intensive uses, such as softball complexes, skate parks, and swimming pools. Relevant to the fee calculations, special park features are typically considerably more expensive than general park improvements.

The existing inventory of parks, consisting of those that primarily serve unincorporated areas as neighborhood and community parks, is presented in Table 3-1. The total acreage of land planned for neighborhood and community parkland is shown for each park. Subsequent columns show (1) the acres of general park improvements; (2) the acres of special park features; and (3) park areas yet undeveloped. This table serves as a base for deriving the existing standards (levels) for parkland: encompassing land for parks; general park improvements; and special park features.

The parks owned and operated by the cities in San Luis Obispo County and those provided by the Templeton Community Services District (TCSD) are not included among the parks listed in Table 3-1. The Templeton District continues to be the only portion of the County's unincorporated area that owns and maintains its parks separately from the County. TCSD levies and collects its own development impact fee.

### ***Types of Facilities***

Table 3-1 lists a total of 18 parks with a total land area of 212.2 non-regional park acres. A total of 44.2 are undeveloped and 168 are developed (more specifically, 150 are developed with general park improvements and approximately 18 acres with special park features.) In other words, about one-fifth of the land area planned for neighborhood and community parks has not yet been developed. This is a common pattern in the development of a parks system. A city or county purchases land as early as possible, as delayed purchases result in increasing difficulty finding suitable parcels and significantly higher land prices. The construction of improvements follows as more funds become available. This pattern was noted in 1990 in the original public facilities fees justification document, where it was observed that a greater share of future parks expenditures would be for parkland improvements than had been the case to that point.

In the 15 years since the PFF program was adopted, improvements have constituted the large majority of park expenditures, while land purchases have been only a small part. More recently, the increase in special features has been particularly important. The Parks Division has experienced a shift in the types of community recreation services desired. Previously, fee revenue was used predominantly to make general park improvements. Recently, however, fee revenues are directed more towards developing more intensive special park features, such as



skate parks. Thus, parks facilities can be assessed more accurately with special park features considered as a category of park improvements separate from general park improvements.

**Table 3-1  
Park Facilities Inventory**

Facility	Total Acres Neighborhood/ Community Parks	Developed General Park Improvement Acres	Estimated Acreage for Special Park Features (2)	Undeveloped Parks Acres	Special Park Features (3)
Avila Park/Plaza	2.5	2.5	0	-	
Biddle Park (1)	27.0	27.0	0	-	
Cuesta Park	5.0	5.0	0	-	
C.W. Clarke Park	11.5	6.5	2.0	3.0	Swimming pool, wading pool, tennis court
El Chorro Park (1)	40.0	40.0	0	-	
Hardie Park	4.0	2.0	2.0	-	Swimming pool, tennis courts
Heilmann Park (1)	10.0	8.0	2.0	-	Tennis courts
Lampton Cliffs Park	2.2	2.2	0	-	
Los Osos Community Park	6.2	2.2	3.0	1.0	Tennis courts, skatepark, barn & historic school building
Norma Rose Park	1.5	0	0	1.5	
Nipomo Park	65	29	6.0	30.0	Four lighted baseball fields, football field, lighted tennis courts, basketball and handball courts
Oceano Memorial Park	11.8	11.8	0	-	
Paul Andrew Park	1.0	1.0	0	-	
San Miguel Park	4.3	3.3	1.0	-	Swimming pool, wading pool
Santa Margarita Community Park	2	2	0	-	
See Canyon Park	8.7	0	0	8.7	
Shamel Park	6.0	5.0	1.0	-	Swimming pool
Templeton Park	3.5	2.5	1.0	-	Swimming pool
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>212.2</b>	<b>150.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>44.2</b>	

- (1) Regional parks with neighborhood/community serving components. Only the acreage for the community-serving component is shown here, exclusive of the regional park portion.
- (2) The assumption is made that each special park features equals an average of approximately one acre. For example, at Hardie Park, special park features encompass 2 acres, as there is one swimming pool and one set of tennis courts.
- (3) Special park features do not include equipment that is characteristic to numerous neighborhood parks, such as play equipment, benches, picnic areas, parking and bathrooms Source: San Luis Obispo County Parks Division, 2005.

## **PARK STANDARDS**

### ***Cost of Park Facilities***

The cost of park facilities is a mixture of the costs of the three components noted above: land; general park improvements; and special park features. In the previous justification document, the cost of parks was based on only a single category of park improvements. However, recent park improvements have increasingly consisted of special park features, to which a significant share of current development impact fees is dedicated.

The average cost of land acquisition is estimated at \$125,000 per acre. This figure was generated through a survey conducted by the San Luis Obispo County Real Property Services Division. The survey appraised the market value of numerous parcels that would be suitable for parklands in various unincorporated areas of San Luis Obispo County. The cost of land varies throughout the County, with a higher land cost for coastal land and in areas where development is denser, and a lower cost in less densely developed areas. The \$125,000 per acre estimate is an average of the appraised market values and reflects the relatively lower land costs outside the urbanized areas where new parks will typically be located and the lower per acre cost of larger parcels, i.e. buying 10 acres rather than a single family lot. (Additional information on land costs is included in Appendix B.)

The cost of development of general park improvements includes the transformation of land into a generic neighborhood park. It includes improvements such as: landscaping, sprinkler systems, parking, lighting, restrooms, covered picnic areas, and children's play areas. The Parks Division estimates the current development cost to average \$250,000 per acre. The price of special park features, such as tennis courts, softball complexes, aquatic centers, and skate parks, is more difficult to quantify in terms of an average per acre cost, due to the unique, cost-intensive development of these facilities on little land. However, based on the most recent park development costs at Los Osos Community Park, the suggested estimate is \$600,000 per special park feature. Given that the magnitude of land area involved in a feature is about an acre, the cost is often referred to in this report as \$600,000 per acre for convenience.

### ***Replacement Cost of Existing Parks***

The unit costs for park facilities can be used together with the inventory of parklands shown in Table 3-1 to determine the replacement cost of existing parks, or said another way, the investment existing residents have in these park facilities, measured by their replacement cost.

Table 3-2 notes projects that are not part of the County Park system, to which the County Parks Division contributed a portion of the cost through a Quimby credit or waiver. These projects are part of the park facilities enjoyed by present residents.

**Table 3-2**  
**Other Public Recreation Facilities Funded by**  
**County Public Facilities Fees and Quimby Fees**

Facility	Location	Amount Funded by the Parks Department
Barney Schwartz Park	City of Paso Robles	\$1,000,000
East Ranch Community Park	Cambria CSD	\$500,000
Nipomo HS Soccer Fields	Lucia Mar USD	\$125,000
Developer Quimby Credits and Waivers (1)	Various	\$419,000
<b>Total Amount</b>		<b>\$2,044,000</b>

(1) Developer contributions of land, easements or improvements, and the majority for trails through or adjacent to subdivisions.  
Source: San Luis Obispo County Parks Division, 2005.

An additional factor in calculating the value of the existing park system is the existing fund balances in the Quimby and Public Facilities Fees accounts. (Quimby fees are discussed below.) These are revenues that have yet to be expended. If no new development were to occur, these funds would provide parks for the existing population; they should therefore be included in the calculation of the investment current residents have in their park system.

As of March 2005, the County had a PFF park fee fund balance of \$3,449,000 and a Quimby fee fund balance of \$2,150,000, for total fund balances of \$5,599,000. The primary reason for the fund balance is the wait for the planning process to determine the facilities on which the funds should be expended. Funds anticipated to be expended for parks in the southern part of the County constitute the majority of the balances.

Table 3-3 sets forth the estimated investment in existing parks, based on their replacement cost. The replacement cost of existing park facilities (and fund balances to be expended for park facilities) is \$82,468,000. This park system serves the 101,460 residents of the unincorporated portion of San Luis Obispo County, with the exception of the 6,949 residents of the Templeton Community Services District, resulting in a service population of 94,511 persons. The replacement cost is thus \$873 per person.

**Table 3-3**  
**Park Replacement Costs**

	Acres	Cost per Acre	Replacement Cost
Land	212.2	\$125,000	\$26,525,000
General Park Improvements	150.0	\$250,000	\$37,500,000
Special Park Features	18.0	\$600,000	\$10,800,000
Subtotal			\$74,825,000
Quimby & PFF Fund Balance			\$5,599,000
Contribution to Other Projects			\$2,044,000
Total Cost			\$82,468,000
Population Served*			94,511
<b>Replacement Cost per Capita</b>			<b>\$873</b>
<b>Replacement Cost without Land per Capita</b>			<b>\$592</b>

\* Excluding the population of cities and of the Templeton Special Services District

Source: County of San Luis Obispo Parks Division and Town Hall Services Consulting, 2005.

### ***Park Facilities Standards***

One concept of standards is the existing level of facilities. The existing levels of neighborhood and community parks facilities for unincorporated area residents are presented in Table 3-4. The standards, based on the current level of facilities, are calculated using the 2005 unincorporated population (less that of Templeton) of 94,511.

The standards are shown for land, parkland developed with general park facilities and special features parkland. Though they provide a useful picture of the existing situation, the standards as shown are not very helpful in determining the responsibility of new development. As noted above, the County will not add land at twice the rate it develops it. An existing standard that consists of a single measure that can be used to determine the contribution necessary from new development to maintain that standard is needed.

**Table 3-4**  
**Neighborhood and Community Existing Park Standards**

	Existing Acres	2005 Unincorporated Population (2)	Acres/1,000 Population
Land (1)	212.2	94,511	2.25
General Improvements	150	94,511	1.59
Special Park Features	18	94,511	0.19

(1) Total Parks Division acres planned for neighborhood and community parks.

(2) 2005 unincorporated population less Templeton residents, County of San Luis Obispo Planning Department.  
Source: Town Hall Services Consulting, 2005.

The replacement cost calculated above can be used for this purpose. If \$873 per person is collected from new development, the revenues will maintain the community's parks standard, expressed as per capita replacement cost, even as these revenues are expended more on park improvements and less on land.

The existing standard can also be expressed in terms of equivalent developed parkland, using cost to determine the equivalent amount. Based on the costs cited above, a ten-acre park, with seven acres of general park improvements and three acres of special features, costs \$4,800,000, or \$480,000 per acre (10 acres \* \$125,000 per acre + 7 acres \* \$250,000 per acre + 3 acres \* \$600,000 per acre). Since the replacement cost of existing facilities for 1,000 residents is \$873,000, dividing this amount by the average cost of developed parkland of \$480,000 per acre results in 1.82 acres per 1,000 population. In other words, the existing investment in parks is equal to 1.82 acres of fully developed parklands per 1,000 residents.

The term "park standard" is often used in a different sense, referring to the intended level of park facilities rather than the existing level. The County of San Luis Obispo has a standard for neighborhood and community parklands in its adopted General Plan. The General Plan standard is 3.0 acres per 1,000 population. This is a relatively low standard.

The Quimby Act offers insight into parkland expectations. This act was approved by the California Legislature. It authorizes California cities and counties to exact contributions to the park system, land for parks where appropriate and an alternative in-lieu fee, as a condition of subdivision. A minimum contribution of three acres is authorized; if a jurisdiction has an existing park standard above three acres, it can require contributions equal to that higher level, up to a limit of five acres per 1,000 population. In other words, it assumes that standards of from three to five acres per 1,000 population are reasonable and that a standard below 3.0 acres per 1,000 should presumably not be the basis for park funding.

The County's General Plan standard of three acres per thousand population is at the lower end of the Quimby range. The existing standard (level) is equivalent to 1.82 acres per thousand, far below the Quimby range.

## **FUTURE PROGRAM**

### ***Facilities Plans***

The San Luis Obispo County draft *Parks and Recreation Element* identifies proposed park facilities needed to serve the County through 2010. Numerous proposed park facilities are noted in Appendix B of the document, including additional trails, neighborhood and community parks, and regional facilities. Also, proposed special park feature projects, such as an aquatic center

and recreation facility in Los Osos and an indoor recreation facility in Nipomo, are included to reflect the changing demand for park facilities for San Luis Obispo County. County Parks' Capital Improvement Program, an assessment of community needs, and the County's ability to fund ongoing maintenance will ultimately determine the implementation of the facilities proposed in the Draft Element. However, recent growth patterns suggest the following projects are likely high priorities: Nipomo Community Park improvements; development of an additional community park in Nipomo, Los Osos, and San Miguel; improvements to Los Osos Community Park; C.W. Clarke Park (Shandon) improvements; and contribution to the Cambria Community Services District's neighborhood park.

### ***Facilities to Serve New Development***

According to the San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building, the population in the unincorporated areas is estimated to increase by 45,090 people between 2005 and 2025, of which 3,126 are projected to reside in the Templeton District, leaving 41,964 as the population growth in the area served by the County's neighborhood and community parks system.

The County's current policy regarding Public Facility Fees is that the fee program should require contributions such that the existing standard will not decrease. The existing parks situation was measured in the discussion above in terms of equivalent developed park acreage and replacement cost per capita. The existing equivalent parks standard is 1.82 acres per thousand persons. The cost of such facilities is \$873 per capita. With Public Facilities Fees maintaining this standard, new development will contribute \$36,635,000, an amount that could provide for the purchase and development of 76 park acres.

It can be noted that basing development fees on a standard below the General Plan standard will make it increasingly difficult over time to catch up to the standard. As the resident population grows, and park facilities increase proportionately, the cost of making up the deficiency increases.

Based on the standard of 3.0 acres of neighborhood and community parks per 1,000 population, which is the approved standard for the County, 126 acres of developed parkland would currently be required to accommodate population growth. At a cost of \$480,000 per acre, the cost for 126 acres of developed parkland to serve the additional 42,000 residents would be \$60,480,000, a cost of \$1,440 per capita.

According to the acreage in Table 3-1, the Parks Division has currently developed 79% of its existing developable neighborhood and community parkland. In keeping with the *Parks and Recreation Element*, the acquisition, development, and improvement of parkland should be consistent with the community needs and growth. As seen with recent park development, special park features, such as recreation centers, ball fields, and aquatic facilities, are the community needs to which the department is responding.

One such way that these needs for special park features, and general park facilities as well, from new development can be better accommodated is through more specifically defined Quimby credits. For example, the developer can provide amenities as part of the project rather than offer land or pay an in-lieu fee. Some past development projects in San Luis Obispo County reflect this possible trend in the use of Quimby credits, with the development of bike paths provided by the developer.

### ***Cost Allocation***

Currently, residential is the only type of development on which impact fees are levied. While some of the parks identified in Table 3-1 are used for company events, such as company ball games and picnics, this practice is considered to be minimal. In the future, if the impact on parks from employees increases, the County may want to consider levying a development impact fee on non-residential development occurring in the county. It should be understood that, as long as the fees are determined based on the existing standard, the total amount of fee revenue would not be increased. The change would simply shift a minor portion of the fee burden to non-residential development.

### ***Impact Fee Calculation***

As noted above, the current practice of San Luis Obispo County is to base PFF fee amounts, not on the County's General Plan park standard, but using the County's existing facilities standard as a basis. Levying fees based on the replacement cost of the current facilities is intended to guarantee that the current standard will not be lowered as a result of new development.

Fees are calculated by multiplying the replacement cost per capita by the average population per unit for single family and multi-family (apartment and condominium) dwelling units. Since the previous Public Facilities Financing Plan was adopted, the average service population for single-family dwelling units has decreased slightly, while that for multi-family dwelling units has increased considerably.

**Table 3-5**  
**Impact Fees**

Replacement Cost per Capita	\$873
Single-Family Detached Average Service Population	2.47
<b>Single Family Detached Impact Fee</b>	<b>\$2,156</b>
Multi-Family Average Service Population	1.88
<b>Multiple Family Impact Fee</b>	<b>\$1,641</b>

*Note: Persons per household are based on 2005 US Census county-wide data.*

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*



Many of the properties for which a parks impact fee is being paid will have previously paid a Quimby fee for the property, providing funds equal to the cost of undeveloped parkland needed to serve the units to be constructed. In that case, the parks impact fee will be reduced by the undeveloped land cost included in its calculation. The parks impact fees for single family and multiple family units are shown in Table 3-6.

**Table 3-6**  
**Impact Fees with Prior Payment of Quimby Fees**

Replacement Cost without Land per Capita	\$592
Single-Family Detached Average Service Population	2.47
<b>Single Family Detached Impact Fee</b>	<b>\$1,462</b>
Multi-Family Average Service Population	1.88
<b>Multiple Family Impact Fee</b>	<b>\$1,113</b>

*Note: Persons per household are based on 2005 US Census county-wide data.*

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## **CITY AND COUNTY COMPARISONS**

To better assess its fee program, the Parks Division for the County of San Luis Obispo requested a survey be completed of comparative city and county parks departments' fee programs. Information was gathered from the San Luis Obispo County cities and the following counties: Kern; Monterey; Napa; San Luis Obispo; Santa Barbara; Santa Cruz; and Sonoma.

The cities generally used significantly higher parks standards to calculate the development fees than does San Luis Obispo County. The standards on which the fees are based range from 3.0 acres per 1,000 population in the Templeton Communities Services District to 7.0 acres per thousand in the City of San Luis Obispo fee program.

The parks standards for the counties are generally lower than for cities. They range from 2.0 acres per 1,000 population for Kern County to 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents for Sonoma County. (Napa County has no parks department and no fee program.) The programs vary considerably in their approach. Santa Barbara and Sonoma Counties have high standards (Santa Barbara levies fees of more than \$8,000 per home along the coast) and are knowledgeable and professional about what they are doing. Some other counties barely bother to levy their fees. The higher standard programs in Santa Barbara and Sonoma Counties are probably partly due to the fact that they, like San Luis Obispo County, have a significant number of unincorporated communities.



## Chapter 4

### SHERIFF'S PATROL & INVESTIGATION

The Sheriff's Department provides some services county-wide through its custody (jails) and civil divisions, and other services solely to the unincorporated area. Unincorporated area services are provided through the Department's patrol and detective divisions. Only facilities associated with services to the residents and businesses in the unincorporated areas are examined in this report.

The patrol and detective divisions of the Sheriff's Department provide services to the unincorporated area similar to those provided by a municipal police department. These services include routine patrol of unincorporated areas, response to emergency and non-emergency calls, and investigation of crimes.

#### SERVICE POPULATION

"Service population" is the indicator used in evaluating the present level of services and future facilities needed to maintain that level. (See Chapter 2) Non-residential activities, as well as the residential population, generate demand for sheriff's services; thus, a broader measure than residential population is used in evaluating future facility needs. Resident generated demand is measured by resident population; non-residential demand is measured by employment. The total demand for sheriff's services is thus assumed to be proportional to the sum of the service population, the sum of persons residing in and persons working in the unincorporated area. The current and projected future resident population and employment are shown in Table 4-1.

**Table 4-1**  
**Persons Served: Sheriff's Services**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Resident Population</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Total</b>
2005	101,460	30,105	<b>131,565</b>
2025	146,550	43,351	<b>189,901</b>
Growth	45,090	13,246	<b>58,336</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

#### FACILITIES

##### *Existing Facilities*

The Department is managed from the county operations center, located on Kansas Avenue about four miles north of San Luis Obispo. Activities there include investigative services, located in the detective's building, the "watch command", including communications and dispatch services,

located in the emergency operations center, and administrative services, located in the administration wing of the jail building.

The space in these buildings has to be allocated between that used for county-wide services and that used for services to the unincorporated area. Because administration is a department-wide function supporting both county-wide and unincorporated area services, administrative space is split between the two service categories. The building square footage used by unincorporated area functions is shown in Table 4-2.

Patrol services are provided primarily through three Sheriff's substations located in Templeton (the north station), Los Osos (the coast station), and Oceano (the south station). The North station has recently been completed. Report rooms scattered throughout the county provide desk space which officers use for preparing reports without having to travel to a substation. These facilities play little role in the department's countywide services.

**Table 4-2**  
**Sheriff's Patrol and Investigation Facilities**

	<b>Building Area (sq. ft.)</b>	<b>Land Area (sq. ft.)</b>
Kansas Avenue		
Detectives Building	9,532(1)	208,000(6)
Operations Center	2,200(2)	
Administrative Wing	4,523(3)	
Range	N/A	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>16,255</b>	<b>208,000</b>
Substations		
Templeton (North)	6,200(4)	43,560
Los Osos (Coast)	3,000	10,000
Oceano (South)	6,200	18,700
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>15,400</b>	<b>72,260</b>
Report Rooms	1,770(5)	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>33,425</b>	<b>280,260</b>

- (1) The Coroner's office, a county-wide function, occupies 968 sq. ft. of the 10,500 square foot Detective's Building.
- (2) The sum of patrol related space and shared space.
- (3) The sum of 3,823 sq. ft. used for unincorporated areas services and half of the 1,400 sq. ft. used for both county-wide and unincorporated area services (e.g. lobby and department-wide administrative functions).
- (4) Recently completed.
- (5) The square footage in five publicly owned report rooms.
- (6) The Sheriff's Department site is 11.25 acres, with about 15% (1.7 acres) unusable. The remaining 9.55 acres are assumed divided equally between county-wide and unincorporated area functions. Sources: Sheriff's Department, San Luis Obispo County and Town Hall Services

The Kansas Avenue facility occupies a sizeable parcel, 11.25 acres. About 15% of the site, 1.7 acres, is unsuitable for development due to a creek and some hillside area, leaving 9.55 usable acres. Half of this area, 208,000 square feet, is allocated to unincorporated area services. Table 4-2 also shows the land of each of the substation sites.

Patrol vehicles and other vehicles are also important capital facilities elements in the delivery of patrol and investigation services. Table 4-3 lists the various vehicles used by the Sheriff's Department. (Vehicles generally used in the provision of countywide services are not included.) The replacement cost of each of the vehicles is also shown.

**Table 4-3**  
**Sheriff's Department Vehicles**

<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Cost per Item</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Patrol Cars	38	\$35,000 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$1,330,000
Unmarked Cars	30 <sup>(1)</sup>	30,000	900,000
Off-road Explorers	5	35,000	175,000
Boat	1	35,000	35,000
Dive Team Truck	1	25,000	25,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$2,465,000</b>

*(1) Three additional cars are assigned to countywide services and are NOT included here.*

*(2) Cars suitable for patrol service, complete with equipment and patrol car paint.*

*Source: Sheriff's Department, San Luis Obispo County.*

### ***Standards***

It is unlikely that building square footage, land area and vehicles will each be needed in the same proportions to accommodate growth. Furthermore, there are no common rule-of-thumb standards for building square footage, land area, and vehicles needed for sheriff's department to serve the unincorporated area. (Compare, for example, the County's General Plan standard of 3.0 acres of neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 population.) It is therefore preferable to analyze present facilities in terms of their replacement cost. The standard can then be expressed in terms of the replacement cost per person served. This is the expenditure that will need to be made as service population grows if the standard of facilities is not to decline.

## **FACILITY COSTS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT**

### ***Facility Costs***

The current estimated cost of building construction is estimated to be \$295 per square foot, based on cost estimates from the General Services building manager. This cost includes all construction related costs (e.g. architectural and engineering), but not land cost. It reflects the factors that result in a relatively high cost for public buildings. (Information about this cost is included in Appendix A.)

Land for sheriff's facilities is less expensive than, for example, land for libraries, as much of the land is likely to be in a larger complex, e.g. the Kansas Avenue site, and sheriff's facilities do not benefit from being located convenient to pedestrian traffic. On the other hand, land for sheriff's facilities are usually more expensive than parkland, partially due to the fact that parkland is generally purchased in larger parcels. The average cost of additional land for sheriff's facilities is estimated at \$5 per square foot (\$218,000 per acre). (More information about land costs is included in Appendix B.)

The cost of vehicles is becoming a major component of sheriff's capital facilities. The replacement cost for existing vehicles is given above in Table 4-3.

The last component is the capital account balance, shown as of June 30, 2004. These funds would be expended for facilities to serve existing development if no new development were to occur.

#### ***Existing Capital Investment***

The replacement cost of existing facilities used for patrol and investigation activities is shown in Table 4-4. The large majority of the investment is in existing buildings, together with their land. Their replacement cost is \$11,261,000 (building square footage \* \$295 construction costs plus land square footage \* \$5 land costs). Vehicle replacement costs add \$2,465,000 and the balance in the fees capital account is \$232,000. The total capital investment in the current sheriff's facilities, as measured by its replacement value, is \$13,958,000. Using the 2005 service population of 101,460 residents and employment of 30,105, a total of 131,565 persons, this results in a replacement cost of \$106 per resident.

**Table 4-4**  
**Replacement Cost of Existing Sheriff's Capital Facilities**

<b>Facilities Component</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Cost per Sq. Ft.</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Building Area	33,425	\$295	\$9,860,000
Land Area	280,260	5	1,401,000
Vehicles	N/A		2,465,000
Capital Account Balance	N/A		232,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$13,958,000</b>
Persons Served			131,565
<b>Replacement Cost per person served</b>			<b>\$106</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## FUTURE PROGRAM

### *Plans*

The Sheriff's Department has had a tentative plan prepared for an addition to the jail. It proposes expansion of the jail into the portion of the administration building currently used by functions related to the unincorporated area. This would likely be made possible by relocation of many sheriff's functions, including those related to patrol and investigation, to a new building sited east of the present sheriff's complex. However, the plan has not been finalized and no plans are underway for funding the improvements. Even if the tentative plan is not implemented, sheriff's activities will be outgrowing the existing buildings. Most of the additional space needed will likely be added at the Kansas Avenue site, east of the current buildings.

The Los Osos station is inadequate in size and has insufficient parking area. A building of the same size and layout of the new substations will be needed. The site needs to be adequate to accommodate parking. Additional parking is also needed at the Oceano station. Additional population and traffic in the County will increase the need for more satisfactory report rooms. The Department feels that the appropriate size of each report station should be about 850 square feet. Finally, there is no long term plan for vehicles needed to provide sheriff's services. However, additional residents and business activity will increase the need for patrol vehicles. They, along with increased travel times, will also make it necessary to have multiple vehicles located in various parts of the County.

### *Cost of Accommodating Growth*

The cost of the additional facilities necessary to maintain existing patrol and investigative service standards in the county can be calculated based on the information developed in this chapter. The cost of the current investment measured by replacement cost is \$106 per resident and per employee. The number of additional residents and employees projected over the next 20 years, as determined through the service population for unincorporated area sheriff's services in Table 4-1, is 45,090 residents and 13,246 employees. Thus, the cost impact for additional sheriff's facilities is approximately **\$6,184,000**.

**Table 4-5**  
**Cost of Accommodating Growth**

Growth in Persons Served	
Residents	45,090
Employees	13,246
<b>Total</b>	<b>58,336</b>
<b>Investment per Person</b>	<b>\$106</b>
<b>Cost</b>	<b>\$6,184,000</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## FEE DETERMINATION

### *Residential Fees*

The investment in the current facilities is \$106 per person served.

For the fees on residential development, the amount per person served is applied to the number of average persons per unit to arrive at a per unit fee. Using U.S. Census data on a county-wide basis, single family units have 2.47 persons per unit and multiple family units have 1.88 persons per unit. The fee amounts per unit are shown in the table below.

**Table 4-6**  
**Impact Fees on Residential Development**

	<b>Single Family</b>	<b>Multiple Family</b>
Cost impact per resident	\$106	\$106
Persons per unit	2.47	1.88
<b>Fee per unit</b>	<b>\$262</b>	<b>\$199</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

### *Non-Residential Fees*

Non-residential development can be classified into three categories: high-density (primarily office space), medium-density (primarily retail space), and low-density (primarily warehouse and industrial space). For each of the categories, the following average number of square feet per employee is estimated: high-density (300 square feet), medium-density (500 square feet), and low-density (700 square feet). These can also be expressed in terms of employees per 1,000 square feet: 3.33 (high-density), 2.00 (medium-density), and 1.43 (low-density). The costs per 1,000 square feet of non-residential development by type are shown in the table below.

**Table 3-6**  
**Impact Fees on Non-Residential Development**

	<b>Office</b>	<b>Retail</b>	<b>Industrial</b>
Cost impact per employee	\$106	\$106	\$106
Average Number of Employees per 1,000 square feet	3.33	2.00	1.43
<b>Fee per 1,000 square feet</b>	<b>\$353</b>	<b>\$212</b>	<b>\$152</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*



## Chapter 5

### GENERAL GOVERNMENT AND OTHER COUNTY FACILITIES

The county departments using the facilities addressed in this chapter provide a variety of direct services to residents and businesses and also provide support services to other county departments. They have been grouped together because their future facilities needs are based on common standards (building square feet and vehicles per capita). Furthermore, most of these departments' facilities needs will increase at the rate of population and business growth during the next 20 years.

These departments provide the majority of its services countywide; other services are provided solely to the unincorporated area. The Assessor's Office and Social Services are examples of services provided to residents and businesses equally throughout the county. Planning and Building and Public Works are example of services provided essentially to the unincorporated area of the county. Only facilities associated with services to the residents and businesses in the unincorporated areas are examined in this report.

### SERVICE POPULATION

"Service population" is the primary indicator used in evaluating the present level of services and future facilities needed to maintain that level. (See Chapter 2.) Non-residential activities generate demand for general government services, as well as the residential population; thus, a broader measure than residential population is used in evaluating future facility needs. Resident generated demand is measured by resident population; non-residential demand is measured by employment. The total demand for general government services is thus assumed to be proportional to the sum of the service population, the sum of persons residing in and persons working in the unincorporated area. The current and projected future resident population and employment are shown in Table 5-1.

**Table 5-1**  
**Persons Served: General Government Services**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Resident Population</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Total</b>
2005	101,460	30,105	<b>131,565</b>
2025	146,550	43,351	<b>189,901</b>
Growth	45,090	13,246	<b>58,336</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## FACILITIES

### *Existing Facilities*

The large majority of the county's office space is located in a complex of buildings located in San Luis Obispo. The buildings include (1) the old courthouse and administration building facing Osos Street between Palm and Monterey Streets, (2) what has been the newer courthouse and administration buildings extending from Palm Street to Monterey Street behind the old courthouse, and (3) the recently completed administration building at the corner of Monterey and Santa Rosa Streets. Some space elsewhere in the City of San Luis Obispo and some space outside of San Luis Obispo is also utilized for county services. The space used by departments providing general government services is listed by department in Table 5-2.

The fee will be calculated based on the square footage of building owned by the County, in effect assuming that there will be a similar portion of leased space in the future. The table therefore shows the publicly owned building space separated from leased space.

San Luis Obispo County has recently completed a new administrative building. It houses the departments noted with an asterisk; they occupy a total of 67,545 square feet. The building is sized to provide the large majority or all of the office space that the County will require at its government complex in the next couple of decades. In other words, a portion of the building should not be included in the facilities that will be serving existing residents and businesses because in a longer term perspective it will accommodate activities that serve both existing residents and businesses and future residential and non-residential growth.

It is assumed here that about half of the space in the new building should not be credited to existing development. This amount, 33,772 square feet, is shown on a separate line and deducted from the space allocated to present development. This share of the new building will be used for the provision of services for future growth over the 20 year horizon of this study.

The number of residents and businesses, as measured by employment, is projected to increase 44.3% over the next 20 years (as shown in Table 5-1). The building area used for services to the present population totals 169,454 square feet. A 44.3% increase is 75,070 square feet. With 33,772 square feet in the new building, approximately 41,300 square feet will be located elsewhere in the city and in other communities; we assume here that the needed building space will be split between the two.

Because the fee is to be levied only in the unincorporated portion of the county, it must be based on the facilities used to provide services to that area. The public space therefore has to be allocated between space used for county-wide services and space used for services to the unincorporated area. The building square footage used by unincorporated area functions is estimated based on the percentage of County employees providing services to the unincorporated area. Table 5-2 therefore shows the employees divided between unincorporated and countywide functions. Thirty two percent of employees work on unincorporated area functions. This percentage is multiplied by the 169,454 square feet of publicly owned building area to determine

the building area used in the delivery of services to the unincorporated portion of the county, 54,225 square feet.

**Table 5-2**  
**General Government and Other County Facilities**

Government Department	Public Space (sq. ft.)	Leased Space (sq. ft.)	Employees	
			Unincorporated	Countywide
Administration, etc.*	7,030	0	9	15
Animal Services	5,100	0	0	21
Assessor*	14,760	1,822	0	87
Auditor-Controller*	7,865	0	15	28
Clerk-Recorder*	8,135	1,365	0	24
Community Rooms*	10,700	0	0	0
Counsel*	6,680	0	8	15
Emergency Operations	11,544	0	0	0
Fleet Services	21,340	0	5	8
General Services	13,597	0	61	109
Information Services	15,587	0	32	56
Personnel*	4,800	0	7	13
Planning and Building	20,290	1,365	104	11
Public Works	14,559	0	165	20
Treasurer*	7,575	0	2	26
Social Services	31,494	55,343	0	435
Veterans Services	2,170	0	0	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>203,226</b>	<b>59,895</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>872</b>
Less Half of New Building	33,772			
Area Serving Existing	<b>169,454</b>			
Percent Uninc. Employees			32%	
Public Uninc. Square Feet	<b>54,225 (1)</b>			

(\*) The departments with asterisks are located in the new county government center building.

(1) Equal to 32% of total public space

Sources: Administration Department, San Luis Obispo County

Cars, trucks, vans and other vehicles are also important capital facilities elements in the delivery of general government services. Table 5-3 lists the various vehicles used by the departments listed in Table 5-2. The replacement cost of the vehicles is also shown. Again, only the portion of vehicles used for services provided only to the unincorporated area should be used here. The department's analysis of vehicle usage by department indicated that about 32% of the usage was for activities serving the unincorporated area. (The reasonableness of this conclusion is indicated by the fact that this is the same allocation as that of employees between countywide and unincorporated area services.)

**Table 5-3**  
**General Government Departments' Vehicles**

<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>All Vehicles</b>	<b>Unincorporated Area Services*</b>
Cars	284	
Trucks	254	
Vans	74	
<b>Total</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>196</b>
<b>Replacement Cost</b>	<b>\$7.90 million</b>	<b>\$2.53 million</b>

*\* Determined to be 32% of all vehicles and costs.*

*Source: Administration Department, San Luis Obispo County.*

### ***Standards***

It is unlikely that building square footage, land area and vehicles will be needed in the same proportions to accommodate growth. Furthermore, there are not common rule-of-thumb standards for building square footage, land area, and vehicles needed for the departments providing general government services to serve the unincorporated area. (Compare, for example, the County's General Plan standard of 3.0 acres of neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 population.) It is therefore preferable to analyze present facilities in terms of their replacement cost. The standard can then be expressed in terms of the replacement cost per person served. This is the expenditure that will need to be made as service population grows if the standard of facilities is not to decline.

## **FACILITY COSTS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT**

### ***Building Costs***

The current estimated cost of building construction is estimated to be \$295 per square foot, based on cost estimates from the General Services building manager. This cost includes all construction related costs (e.g. architectural and engineering), but not land cost. It reflects the factors that result in a relatively high cost for public buildings. (Information about this cost is included in Appendix A.)

### ***Land Costs***

Land costs are discussed in Appendix B. The land costs for general government are expressed as the cost per square foot of building, reflecting the fact that the ratio of site land area to the building on it varies depending on the location and whether parking is surface parking or in a structure. The average cost of land (and parking) for the new county building, for general government facilities elsewhere in the City of San Luis Obispo, and for facilities located in other communities is calculated to be \$109 per square foot of building space.

The replacement cost of vehicles is a major component of general government capital facilities. The replacement cost for existing vehicles is given above in Table 5-3.

The last component is the capital account balance, shown as of June 30, 2004. These funds would be expended for facilities to serve existing development if no new development were to occur.

### ***Existing Capital Investment***

The replacement cost of existing facilities used for general government activities is shown in Table 5-4. The large majority of the investment is in existing buildings, together with their land. The replacement cost of buildings is approximately \$16.0 million (building square footage \* \$295 construction cost) and that for land and parking is \$5.9 million (building square footage \* \$109 land costs). Vehicle replacement costs add \$2.53 million and \$2.078 million is in the capital account designated for payment for facilities. The total capital investment in the current facilities used in the provision of general government services, as measured by their replacement value, is about \$26.515 million. Using the 2005 service population of 101,460 residents and employment of 30,105, a total of 131,565 persons, this results in a replacement cost of \$202 per person.

**Table 5-4**  
**Replacement Cost of Existing General Government Capital Facilities**

<b>Facilities Component</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Cost per Sq. Ft.</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Building Area	54,225	\$295	\$15,996,000
Land		109*	5,911,000
Vehicles	N/A		2,530,000
Capital Account Balance	N/A		2,078,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$26,515,000</b>
Persons Served			131,565
<b>Replacement Cost per person served</b>			<b>\$202</b>

*\*Land (and parking) cost is calculated per square foot of building space.*

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## **FUTURE PROGRAM**

### ***Plans***

As discussed above, the recent construction of the new court and administration building has provided about 45% of the building space required to be added in order to enable the County to expand its services adequately to maintain the same level of service for an expanded resident population and a larger business community. A large portion of the general government component of fee revenue will be devoted to debt service on the new building. No other buildings for general government services are planned in the near future.

There is no long term plan for vehicles needed to provide general government services. However, additional residents and business activity will increase the need for vehicles and increments to the fleet will be purchased as needed.

### ***Cost of Accommodating Growth***

The cost of the additional facilities necessary to maintain existing standards for facilities used in the provision of general government services can be calculated based on the information developed in this chapter. The cost of the current investment measured by replacement cost is \$202 per resident and per employee. The number of additional residents and employees projected over the next 20 years, as determined through the service population for unincorporated area general government services in Table 5-1, is 45,090 residents and 13,246 employees. Thus, the cost impact for additional facilities is approximately **\$11,784,000**.

**Table 5-5**  
**Cost of Accommodating Growth**

Growth in Persons Served	
Residents	45,090
Employees	13,246
<b>Total</b>	<b>58,336</b>
<b>Investment per Person</b>	<b>\$202</b>
<b>Cost</b>	<b>\$11,784,000</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## **FEE DETERMINATION**

### ***Residential Fees***

The investment in the current facilities is \$202 per person served. For the fees on residential development, the amount per person served is applied to the number of average persons per unit to arrive at a per unit fee. Using U.S. Census data on a county-wide basis, single family units have 2.47 persons per unit and multiple family units have 1.88 persons per unit. The fee amounts per unit are shown in the table below.

**Table 5-6**  
**Impact Fees on Residential Development**

	<b>Single Family</b>	<b>Multiple Family</b>
Cost impact per resident	\$202	\$202
Persons per unit	2.47	1.88
<b>Fee per unit</b>	<b>\$499</b>	<b>\$380</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

**Non-Residential Fees**

Non-residential development can be classified into three categories: high-density (primarily office space), medium-density (primarily retail space), and low-density (primarily warehouse and industrial space). For each of the categories, the following average number of square feet per employee is estimated: high-density (300 square feet); medium-density (500 square feet); and low-density (700 square feet). These can also be expressed in terms of employees per 1,000 square feet: 3.33 (high-density); 2.00 (medium-density); and 1.43 (low-density). The costs per 1,000 square feet of non-residential development by type are shown in the table below.

**Table 5-7**  
**Impact Fees on Non-Residential Development**

	<b>Office</b>	<b>Retail</b>	<b>Industrial</b>
Cost impact per employee	\$202	\$202	\$202
Average Number of Employees per 1,000 square feet	3.33	2.00	1.43
<b>Fee per 1,000 square feet</b>	<b>\$673</b>	<b>\$404</b>	<b>\$289</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*



## Chapter 6

### FIRE

The county is served by departments in each of the cities, the Templeton and Cambria Community Services Districts, six community fire departments, and the County Fire Department (CFD), which has primary responsibility for protection in the rest of the county. (The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection provides protection for the undeveloped portions of the county.) The six community fire departments and the CFD, which provide services to the large majority of the land area in the county, participate in the county PFF program. Within the unincorporated county, these community fire departments are: the community services districts of Los Osos, Avila Beach, Oceano and San Miguel; the Cayucos and Santa Margarita Fire Protection Districts. The county contracts with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to provide the fire prevention and suppression services in the area for which it is responsible; this state agency also has separate facilities oriented to fire suppression in the forested areas of the county.

### SQUARE FOOTAGE PROTECTED

To date County residential fire fees have been levied on a per unit basis, similar to that of the other fees. Over time the question has arisen as to whether a fixed fee regardless of the size of the unit (though separate for single family detached units and multiple family units) was appropriate. The majority of the capital costs for the fire department are associated with the protection of property. The size of the unit is an indicator of the value of property protected and thus provides a better nexus for fire capital costs than a fixed fee per unit. On this basis this study recommended that residential fire fees be levied on a square foot basis. A result of this is that additions to residential units will now incur fees levied on the net square feet added. It can be noted that fire fees on non-residential property have always been on a square foot basis.

The CFD and the six community fire departments provide protection on both residential and non-residential square footage in the portion of the county served. Over the next 20 years, residential square footage is projected to increase by 38,348,000 square feet and non-residential by 4,491,000, resulting in a total growth of 42,839,000 square feet requiring protection in the unincorporated areas. Tables 6-1 and 6-2 highlight the current and projected square footage served. (For more detailed explanations of the calculations, please refer to Chapter 2.)

**Table 6-1**  
**Residential Square Footage**  
**Areas Served by the County Fire Department**

	<b>Single Family Detached</b>	<b>Multiple Family</b>	<b>Total Residential</b>
<b>2005 Square Footage Served by County Fire Department</b>	<b>50,851,000</b>	<b>9,408,000</b>	<b>60,259,000</b>
2025 Square Footage Served by County Fire Department	84,006,000	14,601,000	98,607,000
<b>Growth in Square Footage Served by County Fire Department</b>	<b>33,155,000</b>	<b>5,193,000</b>	<b>38,348,000</b>

Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.

**Table 6-2**  
**Non-Residential Square Footage**  
**Areas Served by the County Fire Department**

	<b>Office (1)</b>	<b>Retail (2)</b>	<b>Industrial (3)</b>	<b>Total Non-Residential</b>
<b>2005 Square Footage Served by County Fire Department</b>	<b>2,219,000</b>	<b>4,189,000</b>	<b>3,354,000</b>	<b>9,762,000</b>
2025 Square Footage Served by County Fire Department	3,240,000	6,116,000	4,897,000	14,253,000
<b>Growth in Square Footage Served by County Fire Department</b>	<b>1,021,000</b>	<b>1,927,000</b>	<b>1,543,000</b>	<b>4,491,000</b>

(1) Offices and other buildings with a high employment density, averaging about 300 Sq. ft. per person.

(2) Retail and other buildings with a medium employment density, averaging about 500 sq. ft. per person.

(3) Industrial and other buildings with a low employment density, averaging about 700 sq. ft. per person.

Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.

## FIRE FACILITIES

### *Existing Facilities*

Existing fire facilities are comprised of both buildings and vehicles. Currently, the County operates 22 facilities, totaling 77,300 square feet. The community fire departments operate six additional facilities, totaling 19,316 square feet. The total square footage for existing fire facilities is 96,616. Table 6-3 lists all the facilities and their square foot amounts.

**Table 6-3**  
**Existing Fire Facilities: Buildings**

<b>County Fire Department Facilities</b>		
Facility Number	Facility Name	Size (sq. ft.)
10	Cambria <sup>(5)</sup>	3,200
12	San Luis Obispo <sup>(5)</sup>	3,200
14	Morro Toro <sup>(1)</sup>	1,560
20	Nipomo <sup>(5)</sup>	3,800
22	Mesa	4,000
21	Airport	8,800
30	Paso Robles <sup>(5)</sup>	3,800
31	Shandon <sup>(5)</sup>	3,200
33	Heritage Ranch	5,500
34	Oak Shores <sup>(2)</sup>	0
36	Meridian	5,000
40	Parkhill <sup>(5)</sup>	3,200
42	Carrizo Plain <sup>(1)</sup>	2,100
43	Creston <sup>(1)</sup>	3,240
62	Avila Valley	4,000
	Training Center <sup>(3)</sup>	3,300
	Drill Grounds <sup>(4)</sup>	0
	SLU Headquarters	10,000
	Auto Shop	2,800
<b>Total</b>		<b>70,700</b>
<b>Community Fire Department Facilities</b>		
15	Los Osos	8,900
N/A	Avila Beach	0
1	San Miguel	3,200
1	Oceano Station 61	2,290
1	Oceano Modular	906
1	Cayucos	2,220
1	Santa Margarita	1,800

<b>Total</b>		<b>19,316</b>
<b>Total Square Footage for County and Community Districts</b>		<b>90,016</b>

See footnotes on next page.

- (1) *Reduced value facility.*
  - (2) *Privately owned facility.*
  - (3) *Leased facility from a public agency.*
  - (4) *1.5 acre parcel without a building.*
  - (5) *Public facility shared with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Only the county portion of the facility is shown here.*
- Source: San Luis Obispo County Fire Department, 2005.*

Fire facilities are also comprised of vehicles. The County Fire Department operates a total of 49 vehicles. The community fire departments operate 24 vehicles. The total number of vehicles operated is 73. The various vehicles are listed in Table 6-4 by type, amount, and cost.

**Table 6-4**  
**Existing Fire Facilities: Vehicles**

Area	Vehicle Type								
	Engine	Reserve Engine	Rescue	Water Tender	Crash	Reserve Crash	Utility	Breathing Support	Boat
County Fire Department Vehicles	17	5	7	3	1	1	11	1	3
Community Fire Department Vehicles (1)	9	5	4	0	0	0	6	0	0
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
Typical Cost per Vehicle	\$450,000	\$225,000	\$250,000	\$300,000	\$600,000	\$300,000	\$35,000	\$350,000	\$45,000
<b>Total Cost per Vehicle Type (2)</b>	<b>\$10,900,000</b>	<b>\$1,965,000</b>	<b>\$2,660,000</b>	<b>\$900,000</b>	<b>\$600,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	<b>\$595,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>	<b>\$135,000</b>
<b>Total Cost for All Vehicles</b>	<b>\$18,405,000</b>								

(1) *Community fire departments include Los Osos, Avila Beach, San Miguel, Santa Margarita, Oceano and Cayucos.*

(2) *The cost per vehicle may vary somewhat, depending on the facility; thus, the total cost per vehicle type may not calculate exactly when multiplying the cost per vehicle by the number of vehicles. However, the total amount is as intended.*

*Source: San Luis Obispo County Fire Department, 2005.*

## FACILITY COSTS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT

### *Facility Costs*

In determining the replacement cost of the existing facilities, the construction cost is assumed to be \$325 per square foot for full value facilities (based on the construction cost for the new Airport Station that is currently being constructed) and the land cost is estimated at \$283,000 per acre. Fire stations that are reduced-value stations, namely Morro Torro, Carrizo Plain, and Creston, are assumed to have a value of only \$75 per square foot. These three stations have a total of 6,900 square feet of building space. Thus, for fire station buildings, there is a total of 83,116 full value square footage and 6,900 reduced value square footage. The replacement cost for existing buildings is \$27,530,000. [(\$325 per full value square foot \* 83,116 full value square feet) + (\$75 per reduced value square foot \* 6,900 reduced value square feet) = \$27,530,000.] To calculate the replacement cost, facilities on leased publicly-owned land, such as the Training Center and Drill Grounds, are also included at full value. (Stations that are privately owned, such as Oak Shores, are not integrated into the replacement cost.)

Though the sites vary quite a bit in size, the average site area for existing stations is one and one-half acres. Using this assumption, the total acreage is assumed to be 39.75 acres. The cost for land suitable for fire stations, based on the multiple listing survey, is \$6.50 per square foot, or \$283,000 per acre. The replacement cost for existing land is thus \$11,249,000. Therefore, the total replacement cost of the buildings and land for existing fire facilities is \$38,779,000. This is shown in Table 6-5.

**Table 6-5**  
**Replacement Cost of Existing Fire Facilities:**  
**Buildings and Land**

Full Value Building Cost per Square Foot	\$325
Full Value Building Square Footage	83,116
Total full value building cost	\$27,013,000
Reduced Value Building Cost per Square Foot	\$75
Reduced Value Building Square Footage	6,900
Total Reduced Value Building Cost	\$517,000
<b>Total Building Replacement Cost</b>	<b>\$27,530,000</b>
Total Acreage for County and Individual Districts	39.75
Land Cost per acre	\$283,000
<b>Total land cost of facilities</b>	<b>\$11,249,000</b>
<b>Total Replacement Cost for Buildings and Land</b>	<b>\$38,779,000</b>

*Sources: San Luis Obispo County Fire Department and Town Hall Services, 2005.*

In calculating the replacement cost for existing fire facilities to arrive at a per square foot cost, vehicles must also be included. Table 6-6 incorporates the cost of buildings, land, and vehicles, to arrive at a replacement cost per square foot for the square footage protected. There is an investment of \$0.84 per square foot for the 70,021,000 square feet of buildings currently protected by the fire facilities.

**Table 6-6**  
**Replacement Cost of Existing Fire Facilities**

<b>Component of Fire Service</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Buildings and Land	\$38,779,000
Vehicles	18,405,000
Capital Account Balance	1,380,000
<b>Total Facilities Cost</b>	<b>\$58,564,000</b>
Residential Square Footage	60,259,000
Non-residential Square Footage	9,762,000
<b>Total square footage</b>	<b>70,021,000</b>
<b>Replacement Cost per Square Foot</b>	<b>\$0.84</b>

*Note: Residential and non-residential square footage served are calculated in Chapter 2 as part of the discussion of service population.*

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## **FUTURE PROGRAM**

### ***Plan***

The County Fire Department has a detailed projects list spanning 2005-2020, for which future public facility fees are to be used, including both facilities and vehicles. Some of the projects identified as needed in the near future are: fire stations in the communities of Creston and Nipomo; reserve fire engines for the County; and a heavy rescue truck for the North County.

The outside fire agencies for which the County collects fire fees include the Community Services Districts of Los Osos, Avila Beach, Oceano and San Miguel and the Fire Protection Districts of Santa Margarita, and Cayucos. These fire agencies have identified a list of projects that include expansion of existing stations, future new stations, and new fire service vehicles, water tenders, engines, and rescue vehicles. As fees are collected each outside agency will track the expenditure of these funds and the county will include this in its annual review of the use of facility fees.

### ***Cost of Accommodating Growth***

The cost of the additional facilities necessary to maintain existing fire standards in the county can be calculated based on the information developed in this chapter. The cost of the current investment measured by replacement cost is \$0.84 per square foot. The amount of additional residential and non-residential square footage projected over the next 20 years, as determined through the service square footage for fire, is 42,839,000. Thus, the cost impact for additional fire facilities is approximately \$35,985,000.

## **FEE DETERMINATION**

### ***Space on Which Fees Are Assessed***

The square footage on which fees are assessed is, except as indicated, the square footage as calculated by the building department as part of its plan review process, whether it is new construction or an addition. The exception is when demolition is involved. In that case, the fee is based on the total square footage of new construction minus the square footage demolished, i.e. the net additional square footage being protected with fire services.

### ***Residential Fees***

The investment in the fire system is \$0.84 per square foot protected. As the fee is calculated on a per square foot basis, the exact fee amount per unit will vary. However, to give an estimate of a possible fee amount on new single family and multiple family units, Table 6-7 provides an example of the fee amount on typical single family and multiple family units.

**Table 6-7**  
**Example:**  
**Impact Fees on Residential Development**

	<b>Single Family</b>	<b>Multiple Family</b>
Cost impact per square foot	\$0.84	\$0.84
Estimated average square feet per unit (1)	2,210	1,000
<b>Potential Fee per unit</b>	<b>\$1,856</b>	<b>\$840</b>

*(1) The estimated average square feet per unit reflects the anticipated unit size in the 2005-2025 period. The average square footage per single family unit was calculated by analyzing random samples of 1,200 existing housing units in the unincorporated area of the county in 2005. This average, 1,841 square feet, is approximately 20% below the average size of units now being constructed, resulting in an average of 2,210 square feet per single family unit. For multiple family, a rule-of-thumb average was employed.*

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

### ***Non-Residential Fees***

As with the residential fees, the investment in the fire system for office, commercial, and industrial facilities is \$0.84 per square foot protected. Since the fee is independent of employment, it is thus same per square foot for all categories of non-residential development. An example of the cost of a non-residential development is shown in the table below.

**Table 6-8**  
**Example:**  
**Impact Fees on Non-Residential Development**

Cost impact per square foot	\$0.84
Fee for 10,000 Square Foot Facility	\$8,400

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*



## Chapter 7

### LIBRARIES

Public library services in San Luis Obispo County, excluding the City of Paso Robles, are provided by the San Luis Obispo City-County Library system. The system's facilities include a main library in the City of San Luis Obispo, 14 branch libraries throughout the county and one bookmobile. The library system's operating costs are funded primarily from a portion of property taxes designated for this purpose. The City-County system cooperates with the City of Paso Robles library to serve the total county, with all county residents having access to each facility in the county and its services; this analysis therefore includes the Paso Robles library as part of the system.

### SERVICE POPULATION

As discussed in Chapter 2, service population is the primary indicator used in evaluating the present and future facility needs. For libraries, the population served is more than the residential population; thus, a broader measure is used in evaluating future facility needs. The service population for libraries is determined using the findings of a previous survey which noted that 14% of library use was for business purposes and 86% for personal use. These computations are discussed later in the chapter. In Table 7-1, the current and projected future resident population and employment are noted.

**Table 7-1**  
**Service Population: Libraries**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Resident Population</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Total</b>
2005	247,156	103,100	<b>287,365</b>
2025	328,493	137,123	<b>381,971</b>
Growth	81,337	34,023	<b>94,606</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

### LIBRARY FACILITIES

#### *Existing Facilities*

The main library operated by the San Luis Obispo City-County Library system is a 31,455 square foot facility located in the City of San Luis Obispo, which includes the system's administrative space. The 14 branch libraries have a total of 51,191 publicly owned square feet, plus the 400 square feet leased for the Shandon branch. The system also uses 3,960 square feet

of storage space and a bookmobile within the purview of its services. Table 7-2 lists all the library facilities and square foot amounts.

**Table 7-2**  
**Existing Library Facilities**

<b>Existing Facility</b>	<b>Owned Space (Square Feet)</b>
Arroyo Grande	12,000
Atascadero	7,000
Cambria	2,331
Cayucos	800
Creston (1)	960
Los Osos	3,976
Morro Bay	6,550
Nipomo	4,415
Oceano(2)	1,400
Paso Robles (3)	10,250
San Luis Obispo (4)	31,455
San Miguel	775
Santa Margarita	930
Shandon (5)	
Shell Beach (1)	910
Simmler	294
Storage Space	3,960
Bookmobile	Not Applicable
<b>Total</b>	<b>88,006</b>

(1) The county leases these facilities under long-term, below market rate lease agreements, and therefore they are classified as being owned by the city-county system.

(2) The recently opened Oceano branch is in space leased from another public entity.

(3) Consistent with the previous Public Facilities Financing Plan, Paso Robles is included in the countywide total for library facilities, due to a shared service agreement between the county library system and the Paso Robles library.

(4) The square foot amount listed for the San Luis Obispo Library consists of both county administrative offices and actual library space.

(5) Space leased for the Shandon branch (400 square feet) is not an investment in facilities and is therefore not counted in the calculation of the standard to be used as a basis for development fees.

Source: San Luis Obispo City-County Library, 20/20 Vision: Planning the Future of Your Library, 2002.

In addition to actual library space (including the bookmobile), the library system's capital costs also include books and capital equipment, such as book scanners. While books and equipment were not included when libraries were added to the public facilities fee plan in 1996, they are integral capital facilities essential to the libraries, just as fire engines are essential to the services provided by fire stations. They are thus included in the updated plan. The library system

currently includes 550,318 books and other materials. This figure includes books and materials for both the San Luis Obispo City-County (477,880) and City of Paso Robles (72,438) Library systems. As noted above, the system includes a bookmobile, which is invaluable in providing services throughout the dispersed population. In addition, the balance in the library PFF account as of the end of the last fiscal year was \$2,009,000; this is money contributed by recent development that will be expended for facilities to serve this development.

### ***Standards***

The amount of square feet of space per resident is the most commonly used standard for library facilities. Current facilities throughout the county total about 88,000 square feet, as noted in Table 7-2 (owned space plus the leased Oceano and Shandon spaces). The resident population is currently 247,156. The amount of library space is thus 0.36 square feet per resident. According to the American Library Association, suggested library standards are in the range of 0.5 to 0.8 square feet per person served. San Luis Obispo County is thus significantly below the recommended standards.

While it is typical in the industry for libraries to use strictly resident population to determine the standard, as discussed earlier the San Luis Obispo City-County Library System is using a measure of service based on a service population that includes employees, as an indicator of business use. Since a survey showed that employees are 39% as likely to use the library as residents, employees are weighted only 39% when counted in the service population. For 2005, the service population is 287,365 persons, as shown in Table 1. Thus, the current countywide standard using this measure is 0.31 square feet per resident served, though this measure is not comparable to the American Library Association standard.

Similar to the other facilities and the basis for the previous plan, this plan bases the fee on the existing level of facilities, as it is currently not fiscally realistic to assume the higher accepted standards. We thus determine the existing investment in library facilities per person served, as this is the expenditure that will need to be made as service population grows if the standard of facilities is not to decline.

## **FACILITY COSTS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT**

### ***Facility Costs***

The current estimated cost of library construction has risen substantially from the previously estimated \$213 per square foot (1990 costs). The cost for new facilities is estimated to be \$295 per square foot, based on cost estimates from the General Services building manager.

The amount of land needed, including that for parking, is about four times the building areas, resulting in a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.25. The average cost for land is estimated at \$20 per square foot (\$871,000 per acre), which has risen from the 1996 estimate of \$15 per square foot. (See Appendix B.) Since an average of four feet of land are required for every square foot of building, the cost of land per square foot of building is \$80. The total cost of additional library space, including the cost of land, is thus estimated at \$375 per square foot of building space. The

investment in existing libraries, measured by their replacement cost, is \$33,002,000 (88,006 square feet \* \$375 construction and land costs).

Different from the 1996 Plan, the capital investment in books, materials, and the bookmobile, as well as the balance in the library PFF account, are also included in determining the fee. The cost of new books and other materials averages \$25 per book. The replacement cost of the existing book collection is thus \$13,757,950 (550,318 \* \$25). The replacement cost of the bookmobile is \$231,000. The balance in the capital account is \$2,009,000. These are funds from fees paid by new development for facilities to serve development that has already been permitted.

### ***Existing Capital Investment***

The total capital investment in the current library system, as measured by its replacement value, is \$49,440,000. Using the 2005 service population of 287,365, this results in a replacement cost of \$172 per person. For the employee service population of 103,100, the replacement cost is \$66 per employee.

**Table 7-3  
Replacement Cost of Existing Library System**

<b>Component of Library System</b>	<b>Replacement Cost</b>
Library Facilities	\$33,442,000
Books and Materials	\$13,758,000
Bookmobile	\$231,000
Capital Account Balance	\$2,009,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$49,440,000</b>
Residents' Share (86%)	\$42,518,000
Number of Residents	247,156
<b>Replacement Cost per Resident</b>	<b>\$172</b>
Businesses' Share (14%)	\$6,922,000
Number of Employees	103,100
<b>Replacement Cost per Employee</b>	<b>\$67</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## **FUTURE PROGRAM**

### ***Plan***

According to the San Luis Obispo City/County Library's *20/20 Vision: Planning the Future of Your Library (2002)* and other documents, potential capital improvements using PPF monies include: building libraries in Templeton, Nacimientto, Grover Beach and Pismo Beach; expanding the Atascadero Library through the purchase of additional land and other improvements; expanding the Arroyo Grande Library to accommodate the growing number of

residents in the South County region; acquiring additional books and other materials; and possible automation improvements to serve additional populations efficiently.

### ***Cost of Accommodating Growth***

The cost of the additional facilities necessary to maintain existing library standards in the county can be calculated based on the information developed in this chapter. The cost of the current investment measured by replacement cost is \$172 per resident and \$67 per employee. The number of additional residents and employees projected over the next 20 years, as determined through the service population for libraries in Table 7-1, is 81,337 residents and 34,023 employees. Thus, the cost impact for additional library facilities is approximately **\$16,270,000**.

**Table 7-4**  
**Cost of Accommodating Growth**

	Replacement Cost per person	Additional persons	Cost Impact
Residents	\$172	81,337	\$13,990,000
Employees	\$67	34,023	\$2,280,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$16,270,000</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## **FEE DETERMINATION**

### ***Residential Fees***

The investment in the library system is \$172 per resident and \$67 per employee served.

Since the large majority of library use is personal (non-business), it is residential development that is largely responsible for the need for increased library facilities. As referenced in the 1996 plan, a study conducted for the library department revealed that 14% of the surveyed patrons using the library were doing so for work-related purposes, with the other 86% using it for non-business activities. It can be shown that this is equivalent to stating that business use, measured per employee, is only 39% of residents use, measured per resident. These allocations are still relevant.

For the fees on residential development, the amount per person served is applied to the number of average persons per unit to arrive at a per unit fee. Using U.S. Census data on a county-wide basis, single family units have 2.47 persons per unit and multiple family units have 1.88 persons per unit. The fee amounts per unit are shown in the table below.

**Table 7-5**  
**Impact Fees on Residential Development**

	Single Family	Multiple Family
Cost impact per resident	\$172	\$172
Persons per unit	2.47	1.88
<b>Fee per unit</b>	<b>\$425</b>	<b>\$323</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

***Non-Residential Fees***

Non-residential development can be classified into three categories: high-density (primarily office space); medium-density (primarily retail space); and low-density (primarily warehouse and industrial space). For each of the categories, the following number of employees per 1,000 square feet is estimated: 3.33 (high-density); 2.00 (medium-density); and 1.43 (low-density). The costs per 1,000 square feet of non-residential development by type are shown in the table below.

**Table 7-6**  
**Impact Fees on Non-Residential Development**

	<b>Office</b>	<b>Retail</b>	<b>Industrial</b>
Cost impact per employee	\$67	\$67	\$67
Average Number of Employees per 1,000 square feet	3.33	2.00	1.43
<b>Fee per 1,000 square feet</b>	<b>\$223</b>	<b>\$134</b>	<b>\$96</b>

*Source: Town Hall Services, 2005.*

## Chapter 8

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING MITIGATION

*Note: This Chapter has not been proposed for revision at this time. It is currently Chapter IX of the existing Public Facilities Financing Plan and has been carried over in its entirety in this document. As the County is currently reviewed its programs to achieve affordable housing and this may require review and modification to these provisions, no changes are proposed at this time.*

The provision of affordable housing is a policy goal of the County of San Luis Obispo as stated in Chapter 4 of the Housing Element of the County's adopted General Plan. The County currently operates programs to promote the supply of affordable housing, but these programs are insignificant as shown by the number of proposed affordable housing programs in the Housing Element. With the adoption of public facilities fees to fund facilities required to accommodate new development, the County was concerned that these fees would be a disincentive for residential developers to help achieve the County's housing policy objectives.

This chapter documents an **in-lieu mitigation** fee on market rate units of residential projects to prevent the public facilities fee program from undermining the County's affordable housing policy objectives. The in-lieu mitigation fee is not calculated to fund the entire subsidy necessary to build affordable housing units. Rather, the objective of the in-lieu fee is for development projects that include less than the affordable units to be charged a sufficient amount to pay public facilities fees of other projects to the extent that they include more than that share. The practical effect of the program is that all market rate units will pay an in-lieu mitigation fee in addition to the public facilities fees, and all affordable housing units will pay neither public facilities fees nor the in-lieu fees.

The in-lieu fee will apply to all new residential development in unincorporated areas. The fee will not apply to non-residential development because by definition such projects do not have the option whether or not to make available new affordable residential units.

#### LEGAL AND POLICY BASIS FOR FEE

The fee presented in this chapter is to partially mitigate the impacts of market rate residential development on the supply of affordable housing. The fee is an in-lieu mitigation fee and is not a public facilities fee for the reasons discussed below.

As noted in earlier chapters of this plan, public facilities fees must be adopted in accordance with Government Code Section 66000 et seq., also known as AB-1600. Public facilities fees can only fund the cost of public facilities required to accommodate new development. However, the County is anticipating that many future very low and low-and-moderate income housing units would not be publicly owned. Equally important, there is currently little publicly owned housing in the county; there is a large existing deficiency. Thus, a public facilities fee was not selected to address the County's affordable housing policy objectives.

However, California law mandates that counties and cities adopt certain programs, and allows discretionary adoption of other programs, to promote the availability of affordable housing. State

mandated programs adopted by the County include:

- A density bonus for projects that include minimum amounts of affordable housing;
- A requirement that all projects of 11 or more units in the coastal zone include 15 percent or more affordable units;
- Permission of secondary dwellings in areas supported by community resources and facilities; and
- Sufficient amounts of land designated (zoned) for housing to meet the County's share of regional housing needs.

In addition, the County has adopted additional programs to promote the increased supply of affordable housing. These programs include:

- Exemption of low and moderate income households from the County's Growth Management Ordinance;
- Provision of federal Section 8 rental assistance;
- Competition for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) to subsidize low income housing; and
- Participation in the State's mobilehome park resident ownership program to facilitate conversion of homes in mobilehome parks to low-income resident ownership.

State law also allows local agencies to adopt "*inclusionary zoning*" programs based on the idea that new housing projects should include an appropriate amount of affordable housing. This approach mitigates the negative impact that market rate residential projects have on the availability of affordable housing. Market rate projects cause this impact by reducing the supply of land available for affordable housing. Furthermore, decreased land supply contributes to increased land costs and constrains the ability of developers to provide affordable units. The fee program described below is to help address the County's affordable housing policy objectives as mandated by the State and implemented through local policies and programs.

## **DESCRIPTION OF FEE PROGRAM**

All new development must pay all applicable public facilities fees to maintain equity between different types of new development, and between new development and the existing population. However, as stated previously, the County does not want its public facilities fee program to inhibit attainment of its affordable housing goals by raising the cost of development. To this end, the in-lieu mitigation fee has been structured so that developers will not have a disincentive to include the appropriate amount of affordable units in their residential projects.

The program operates by imposing a fixed in-lieu mitigation fee on each market rate unit. The fee will be used to fund the public facilities fees that would otherwise have been paid by affordable units.



With this approach, each residential project will fall into one of the following categories:

1. If the proposed residential project **includes exactly enough** affordable units to comply with County policy, then the in-lieu fee paid will equal the public facilities fees needed to fund the facilities associated with those affordable units.
2. If the proposed residential project **includes fewer** affordable units than needed to comply with County policy, then the in-lieu fee paid will provide a surplus to fund the public facilities fees on the remaining number of required affordable units, wherever those units may be built in the county.
3. If the proposed residential project **includes more** affordable units than needed to comply with County policy, then the public facilities fees associated with those units above the amount will be paid by the surplus in-lieu fees generated by projects in category (2), above.

The effect of this approach is that, to the extent a project finds it infeasible to comply with the County's policy, it will supply funds to pay public facilities fees for affordable units in projects that are over the standard. Projects that include exactly the amount of the standard are not affected. In this case, the combined in-lieu mitigation and public facilities fees on the market rate units will equal the cost of the public facilities fees applied to all units (market rate and affordable).

## **FEE CALCULATION**

Two key factors are needed to calculate the affordable housing in-lieu mitigation fee. The first factor is the definition of an affordable unit. For the purpose of the in-lieu fee, the definition is the same as that used by the County in its density bonus program as described in Section 22.04.090 and Section 23.04.090 of the Land Use Ordinance and Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance, Title 22 and Title 23 of the County Code respectively. Furthermore, affordable units must continue to remain available upon resale or re-lease by complying with these definitions for the time periods following their construction as specified in Title 22 and Title 23.

The second key factor is the County's standard for affordable housing in the unincorporated area as a percentage of all new housing. This factor should result in the surplus in-lieu fees paid by residential projects with fewer affordable units than the standard equaling the public facilities fees required for projects with more affordable units than the standard. To accomplish this outcome, the affordable housing in-lieu mitigation fee should be based on the average number of new housing units that likely will be affordable given the incentives in existing County policies and programs. Using recent residential development as a guide, the in-lieu fee is based on the estimate that 3.5 percent of all new units will be

affordable. Thus, 3.5 percent becomes the policy standard for provision of affordable units. Calculation of the in-lieu mitigation fee is shown below:

$$\text{Affordable Housing In-Lieu fee} = 3.5\% \times \text{applicable public facilities fee}$$

The in-lieu mitigation fee as calculated would apply to all market rate housing units, regardless of the number of affordable units included in the proposed project. Neither the in-lieu fee nor any public facilities fees would apply to affordable units. With this approach, the in-lieu fee is mathematically equivalent to the public facilities fees that would be assessed on the number of affordable units that would be necessary to add to the project to achieve the policy standard. The fee will be reviewed and revised as appropriate to ensure that in-lieu fee revenues balance with public facilities fees associated with affordable units.

## **Appendix A**

### **BUILDING COSTS**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The cost for a public agency to construct a building suitable for public access is quite high; the quality (durability) of construction must be above that typical of a privately constructed building. It must also be remembered that the so-called “soft costs”, such as architectural & engineering, fees, management, etc., add significantly to the cost. The County General Services Division suggests that a construction cost of \$295 per square foot of building is an appropriate figure to use in the calculation of fees on new development.

The county has recently completed a new administration building. It will provide a significant portion of the office space needed for the county to serve a greater population and more businesses. It is thus an appropriate check on the Division’s estimate of building costs. The building cost \$25.00 million for construction together with \$7.85 million in soft costs, a total of \$32.85 million.

The building includes 98,400 square feet of space, not including the 62,200 square feet of parking under the building. Allocating the total cost between the building space and the parking, the cost of building space was \$254 per square foot. Adjusting this figure for inflation over the last two years per the cost of Class B construction increases the cost 16.3%, to \$295, the same figure suggested by the General Services Division.

Building construction costs do not vary nearly as much as land costs. While government offices and libraries vary in their internal furnishing, their costs are similar. This cost figure is therefore used for all buildings except fire stations. Fire stations have a slightly higher cost due to (1) the need for flooring that can bear the weight of fire engines and (2) the need for a structure capable of withstanding severe earthquakes and other disasters without having services interrupted. Accurate information on the current cost of construction of fire stations is available from the current construction of the station at the airport. The cost of this station is \$325 per square foot, about 10% higher than that of other county buildings. This is the amount used in calculating the fire component of the fees.



## **Appendix B**

### **LAND COSTS**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The typical cost of land for a facility differs among the various departments. These variations reflect the part of the county in which the facilities will be located; for example, the facilities used in the provision of general government services will be primarily in the City of San Luis Obispo, while fire facilities will be spread throughout the county. Costs will vary depending on the size of parcels required; for example, the large parcels suitable for parks will cost less per acre than the relatively small parcels suitable for libraries. This appendix therefore determines separate average future land cost for each department providing services to the unincorporated area.

The estimated average land costs are based primarily on information from two sources. The Real Property Services Division of the San Luis Obispo County provided information on recently sold parcels, along with some listed for sale but as of now unsold. It gathered information from a realtor in each of seven communities regarding sales and listings of parcels suitable for parkland and an estimate of a realistic average price. The Division also searched the multiple listing service (MLS) database for parcels potentially suitable for libraries, fire stations and general government offices. It identified MLS listed parcels that for each department (1) fit at least some of the site criteria appropriate for that department and (2) were located in communities where the department expects to construct a future facility. This information provided factual data on which to base the land cost estimates.

It should be recognized that while the data is very helpful in estimating the range of costs for land parcels with some differing characteristics in different areas, no specific consideration was given to factors such as location within a general area, topography, zoning, listing vs. sale, etc. Some adjustments were made (e.g. for inflation since sale) and some parcels not used because they didn't appear to be suitable (e.g. a much larger parcel than needed). In other words, the resources were not available to evaluate adequately the suitability of each parcel for the public facility envisioned. In fact, because the lower priced parcels are more likely to have limitations on their use, this method tends to provide a conservatively low estimate of land costs.

Secondly, most of the departments have plans for future facilities, with at least order-of-magnitude cost estimates. These expectations, and the basis for them, also played a role in determining the appropriate land purchase cost estimates.

## **PARKS**

The parkland cost estimated by the seven realtors in the parkland survey were as follows:

<b>Community</b>	<b>Estimated Cost per Acre</b>
Avila Beach	\$ 213,000
Edna Valley	126,000
Los Osos	100,000
Oceano	150,000
Nipomo	150,000
San Miguel	23,000
Santa Margarita	97,000

The average of these figures for seven communities in which the Parks Division sees the need for additional parkland is \$123,000 per acre (or \$2.82 per square foot).

The Parks Division has found it difficult to generalize about the cost of parkland in the county, as it varies from very low costs for land in the isolated communities to very high costs for sites in the more developed coastal area. Perhaps because more of the recent purchases have been in the coastal communities, the department has expected costs of at least \$150,000 per acre (\$3.44 per square foot). Given that the department's expectations do not have organized data to support them, a figure only slightly above the average land cost determined in the survey by the Real Property Services Division, \$125,000 per acre, is the land cost assumed in calculating the parks fee component.

## **SHERIFF**

The majority of the sheriff's patrol and investigation facilities are located at the Kansas Avenue site and the majority of future facilities are likely to be built on a Kansas Avenue parcel near the existing site. A smaller land parcel is likely to be purchased in the coastal area as a site for a replacement for the Los Osos substation. (Land could perhaps be purchased for report facilities, either by themselves or, more likely, in combination with other county facilities).

The multiple listing survey did not include a category for sites suitable for sheriff's facilities. Of the departments that were included in the survey, the fire department's site needs are probably most similar to those of the sheriff. The sites suitable for fire services from the survey had an average cost of \$6.32 per square foot in the Arroyo Grande area and \$7.77 per square foot in the Nipomo area. (The third fire site for which sales data was obtained, Creston, is in an isolated area and thus would have significantly lower prices than the Kansas Avenue site which is located a few miles from San Luis Obispo.) These prices are probably a little high for the Kansas Avenue site, because

they are smaller parcels. They are probably appropriate for smaller parcels for a substation or for report facilities.

The Sheriff's Department has had no reason to estimate the value of the Kansas Avenue property. However, it and Town Hall Services have been using \$5.00 per square foot as a reasonable land cost assumption. Because the multiple listing data supports this figure, it is used in the calculation of the Sheriff's Patrol and Investigation component of the fee.

## **GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

In the case of the building space used to provide general government services, a large portion of the space needed to serve new development has been constructed as part of the new county government center building. Assuming one half of the building will be used for services to accommodate new development, it will provide 45% of the building space needs caused by that growth. Other general government facilities will be located elsewhere in the City of San Luis Obispo and in communities with central locations in the north and south portions of the county. We assume that these facilities will be provided half elsewhere in the downtown area of San Luis Obispo and half in other communities.

The high cost of land near the government complex in San Luis Obispo made it more cost effective to construct parking under the building than to buy additional land for surface parking. It is estimated that the underground parking adds \$93 to the cost of each square foot of the new administration building. (The actual cost incurred was \$80 per square foot of building; that figure is adjusted up 16.3 percent, inflation for the last two years as measured by the Class B cost of construction index.)

The large majority of general government facilities are office space located in the most "downtown" areas. No vacant land listings were available for the downtown area of the City of San Luis Obispo. This means that redevelopment is usually required, as it is difficult to convert existing buildings to the standards of a public facility. Therefore, the parcels used were those for which the existing buildings constituted a fairly small portion of the site value.

The average cost in the survey of multiple listing parcels in downtown San Luis Obispo is \$116 per square foot. Given a ratio of four square feet of building for each square foot of land [a floor area ratio (FAR) of 4.0], the cost of land per square foot of building is \$29. The total cost of land and parking is thus \$122 per square foot of building.

In other communities, it is likely to be more cost effective to purchase a site with sufficient area to provide surface parking. A facility located to be accessible to populations in various parts of the

county would likely be located in a community and the site costs would be similar to that for a library. The library cost of \$20.27 per square foot is therefore used for such facilities. To have sufficient area for on site parking, the site area would generally be at least four times the building area (an FAR of 0.25). The land cost would thus be \$81 per square foot of building area.

Elsewhere in the City of San Luis Obispo, the choice of structure or surface parking would depend primarily on the land cost. The assumption here is to use the average land cost for general government site in the City of San Luis Obispo and assume a FAR of one, a conservative assumption. The land cost is the \$116 per square foot of land indicated by the MLS data.

The average of the land costs per square foot of building for these three situations, weighted by the prevalence of each, is \$109 per square foot of building. This is the figure used in the fee calculations.

## **FIRE**

The multiple listing survey identified sites in three communities that on the surface appeared to possible fire station sites. Excluding those above four acres, the per square foot cost averages for these sites is \$6.32 per square foot for Arroyo Grande, \$7.77 per square foot for Nipomo, and \$1.62 per square foot for Creston. The weighted average of these costs is \$6.50 per square foot. (Arroyo Grande and Nipomo are somewhat typical of areas served; Creston is atypical in the extent of its isolation. The three costs were therefore weighted 45%, 45% and 10% respectively.)

The majority of existing stations are between one and two acres in size. The department will strive to have sites for future stations of about two acres.

## **LIBRARIES**

The library department has identified three communities in which additional library facilities are needed: Atascadero, Nipomo, and Los Osos. MLS data was searched for suitable sites in these communities. The average land price in the three communities was \$17.99, \$23.02, and \$19.82 per square foot. The average of these three prices is \$20.27 per square foot.

The San Luis Obispo City-County Library System had estimated the cost of land to be \$15 per square foot in 1996 when the libraries impact fee was adopted. In the last few years, staff have been anticipating that land costs would be about \$20 per square foot; more recently they have come to doubt that suitable sites could be obtained at that price. However, the average price of MLS parcels supports the use of \$20 per square foot as the cost for land for library facilities.